Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, Calif., $2,471,000.

This center provides public works, public utilities, housing, transportation support, engineering services, and other logistic support to eight major naval activities in the San Diego area.

The steam distribution project will provide steam distribution lines to berthing piers. The existing lines are inadequate and deteriorated.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$208,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	208,000
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	208,000

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Steam distribution (1st increment)	$131,286	16

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $2,471,000 for steam distribution. What is included in this increment?

Captain WATSON. This first increment is also called "Cold Iron" even though it is on the naval station. It brings the steam from the boiler plant to the piers. The present utilities are undersized and badly deteriorated. San Diego's cold iron problems are mostly in the area of steam. The San Diego Naval Station steam problem is the worst in the Navy.

The second increment will bring the steam lines out on the remaining piers that have not been improved.

Mr. SIKES. Will the second increment meet the program?

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir, at $3,265,000.

Mr. SIKES. In what year?

Captain WATSON. Tentatively planned for 1975.

Mr. DAVIS. When you talk about cathodic protection, what are we talking about?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, the corrosion of pipes, steampipes particularly, is caused by action between the surrounding environment, the soil, and the pipe itself. A little battery action is set up and it causes the pipes to erode away. By using cathodic protection, we reverse this procedure and more or less neutralize the electrolytic action which takes place.

Mr. DAVIS. What does this involve?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This involves a generator which causes a countercurrent action to what we expect is happening from the soil.

NAVY SUBMARINE SUPPORT FACILITY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Insert in the record page I–188.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVY SUBMARINE SUPPORT FACILITY

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET	6115-750	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	(ARMY-1890) NAVY-1962	SAN DIEGO	WITHIN CITY

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide logistic support to assigned submarine forces. Services include harbor and waterfront, ordnance, personnel services, berthing, and messing, athletic and recreational, training, supply, communications, security, and other logistics.

Major Activities Supported:
Submarine Flotilla One
2 Attack Submarine Squadrons
Deep Submergence Group

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 Dec 1972	349	4,276	44	0	0	23	131	0	4,823
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977	349	4,284	44	4	30	20	121	0	4,852

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	314	0	12,108	12,108
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	(0)	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				12,108
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				4,121
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				3,920
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				9,201
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				29,350

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	53	SF	73,476	2,667	73,476	2,667
812.90	PIER UTILITIES	1	LS	-	1,253	-	1,253
				TOTAL	3,920		3,920

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

NAVY SUBMARINE SUPPORT FACILITY, SAN DIEGO, CALIF., $3,920,000

This facility is the homeport of all west coast submarines. The only other base in the Pacific is at Pearl Harbor. This facility supports two submarine squadrons, two submarine tenders, and the deep submergence program.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living quarters for 468 men currently living in 8 wood frame, substandard, open bay, deteriorated World War II barracks.

The pier utilities project will provide "cold iron" utilities to two piers used by submarine tenders and attack submarines.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$10,041,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	6,762,745
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	8,338,051

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters	$117,533	20
Pier utilities	64,822	17

Current bachelor enlisted status at NSSF, San Diego:	
1. Effective BEQ requirement	1,102
2. Adequate assets	365
Installation	358
Community	7
3. Deficit	737
4. Fiscal year 1974 project	468
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	269

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $3,920,000 for bachelor enlisted quarters and pier utilities. Tell us about the requirement for pier utilities here.

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, at the facility at San Diego there are three piers, two main piers, 5000, a long pier with an extension approved in the 1973 program and a stub pier, or just a short pier, 5001. There is a tender at each one of the two piers. These utilities will put steam, compressed air, and enlarge the waterlines on the piers, so that MUSE equipment can be used to supply steam to the tenders to permit them to shut down their boiler. Also the tenders can supply steam to each other as well as supplying compressed air to the submarines alongside.

This project, along with the electrical distribution lines included in it, will furnish all the "cold iron" necessary for these two piers.

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Turn to page 191. Insert that page in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL WEAPONS STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL ORDNANCE SYSTEMS COMMAND	6805-700	SEAL BEACH, CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1944	ORANGE	WITHIN CITY

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Receive, renovate, maintain, store and issue ammunition, explosives, expendable ordnance items and/or weapons and technical ordnance material.

Major Functions:
- Receive, store, assemble, alter, test, issue and tranship surface and air-launched guided missiles
- Maintain and operate:
  - Weapons evaluation and engineering facility
  - Classified ordnance facility
  - Anti-submarine warfare weapons facility

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	40	301	1,697	0	0	0	0	0	2,038
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	34	316	1,697	0	0	0	0	0	2,047

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	13,822	6,596	36,162	42,758
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0* - 34#	0* - 22#	0	22
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				42,780
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				820
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,528
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				7,070
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				52,198

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS WITH MESS	75	SF	18,290	721	18,290	721
	FALLBROOK ANNEX						
721.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS WITH MESS	62	SF	20,892	807	20,892	807
				TOTAL	1,528		1,528

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, CA., $1,528,000

This station receives, renovates, maintains, stores and issure ammunition, explosives, expendable ordnance items and provides logistics support for surface and air-launched guided missiles.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide messing and modern living quarters for 90 men currently living in substandard, inadequate quarters with unreliable utilities.

At the Fallbrook Annex, the bachdlor enlisted quarters project will provide messing and modern living quarters for 82 men currently living in temporary WW II barracks.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters w/mess	$41,010	30
Bachelor enlisted quarters w/mess	42,650	31

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NWS, Seal Beach, California

1. Effective BEQ requirement	105
2. Adequate Assets	4
Installation	-0-
Community	4
3. Deficit	101
4. Fiscal Year 1974 Project	90
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	11

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NWS, Seal Beach, Fallbrook

1. Effective BEQ requirement	85
2. Adequate Assets	-0-
Installation	-0-
Community	-0-
3. Deficit	85
4. Fiscal Year 1974 Project	82
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	3

Mr. SIKES. The request is $1,528,000 bachelor enlisted quarters with mess at two locations.

Both of these have a rather low priority. Does that mean community support has increased to the point they may not be needed? Does it mean there may be a change in the projected population which would impair the need?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, these low priorities merely reflect the type battle we have each year in establishing priorities within our system. We do not anticipate any change in the total numbers of people, nor do we anticipate greater community support. It is just a battle of the numbers.

Mr. SIKES. The need is there and it is serious?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We feel definitely it is.

Mr. SIKES. What facilities are you replacing with this addition?

Captain WATSON. Presently at Seal Beach, the Navy personnel are in old wooden World War II-type construction and the Marines are in a permanent construction building that is uneconomical to rehabilitate. The new facility will replace both of these buildings and combine all the personnel in one new facility. Seventy-five miles away at the Fall Brook Annex, a very similar condition exists, but at this installation the Marines' permanent construction barracks is within explosive arcs and again both will be combined in one facility.

There is almost no community support at Fall Brook.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. SIKES. Place pages 194 and 195 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization Project Amount	Authorization Installation Total	Appropriation Project Amount	Appropriation Installation Total
TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT				
State of California				
Naval Air Station, Alameda (PACFLT)				
P-068 Pier Utilities (821.50-279,000 BH)	3,827		3,827	
Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda (CNM)				
P-703 Avionics Building Environmental Control (211.61-82,000 SF)	1,409		1,409	
		5,236		5,236
Naval Air Station, Lemoore (PACFLT)				
P-830 Integrated Avionics Shop (211.37-39,048 SF)	1,933		1,933	
P-813 Dental Clinic (540.10-15,960 SF)	1,333		1,333	
		3,266		3,266
Naval Air Station, Moffett Field (PACFLT)				
P-065 Taxiway Overlay (112.10-LS)	2,115		2,115	
P-402 Aircraft Parking Apron (113.20-41,250 SY)	750		750	
P-403 Fuel Storage (121.10-LS)	300		300	
P-096 Avionics Shop (211.37-34,300 SF)	1,600		1,600	
P-017 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization (721.11-72 MN-22,619 SF)	500		500	
		5,265		5,265
Naval Hospital, Oakland (BUMED)				
P-103 Warehouse Facility (442.10-36,000 SF)	768		768	
P-030 Hospital Alterations (510.10-LS)	4,260		4,260	
P-101 Enlisted Men's and Chief Petty Officers' Club (740.63-13,040 SF)	811		811	
		5,839		5,839

Installation and Project	Authorization Project Amount	Authorization Installation Total	Appropriation Project Amount	Appropriation Installation Total
TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT CONT'D				
State of California (Cont'd)				
Hunters Point Naval Shipyard San Francisco (CNM)				
P-401 Dry Dock Support Facility (213.90-50,000 SF)	250	250	250	250
Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island (COMNAVSECGRU)				
P-052 Dispensary and Dental Clinic (550.10-8,200 SF)	641	641	641	641
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo (CNM)				
P-150 Electronic Shop Alterations (217.10-11,100 SF)	200		200	
P-120 Electrical Distribution System Improvements (1st Increment) (812.30-LS)	1,874	2,074	1,874	2,074
TOTAL - TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT		22,571		22,571

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $33,571,000.

PROJECTS IN SUPPORT OF BASE REALINEMENTS

For the record, tell us which of the projects requested in this naval district are to support realinements. Provide details for fiscal year 1974 and outyears for the record.

[The information follows:]

BASE REALINEMENT PROJECTS

The following fiscal years 1974 and 1975 projects are being requested for the 12th Naval District to support base realinement actions:

Location and project	Fiscal year	Amount (thousands)
NSY Hunters Point: Dry dock support facilities	1974	$250
NAS Moffett Field:		
BEQ modernization	1974	500
Parking apron	1974	750
Fuel storage	1974	300
Aircraft hangar	1975	2,400
Supply facility	1975	400
NWS Concord: Quality evaluation laboratory addition	1975	368

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIF.

Mr. SIKES. Place page I–196 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	NAVY		NAVAL AIR STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET	1451-064	ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1942	ALAMEDA	WITHIN CITY

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS: Provide all services, material facilities, training and maintenance necessary to support the operations of assigned aviation activities and other naval operating units.

Major Activities Supported:

Naval Air Reserve Training Detachment
Air Reserve Squadrons
Fleet Weather Centrel

Homeport for 6 aircraft carriers
Naval Air Rework Facility

Major Programs Supported:

Aircraft - A-1, P-3
Missiles - Sparrow, Sidewinder, Shrike
Engine - J-52, J-65, T-56

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	1,388	17,835	8,172	57	97	113	22		27,684
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	659	12,388	7,649	0	0	113	445	0	21,254

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,435	8,443	125,450	133,893
b. LEASED AND EASEMENTS	1,770* - 19#	19* - 0#	565* - 0#	565
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				134,458
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				19,700
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				5,763 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				35,457
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				195,378

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b		d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
821.50	PIER UTILITIES	1	BH	279,000	3,827	279,000	3,827
	NAVAL AIR REWORK FACILITY						
211.61	AVIONICS BUILDING ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL	30	SF	82,000	1,409	82,000	1,409
				TOTAL	5,236		5,236

1/ INCLUDES $527,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

DD FORM 1 OCT 72 1390

NAVAL AIR STATION, ALAMEDA, CALIF., $5,236,000

This seaport industrial station provides waterfront facilities for the homeport of refrigerated cargo ships and aircraft carriers. A tenant, the naval air rework facility, is the major overhaul point for A–3 and P–3 aircraft.

The pier utilities project will provide the final segment of a program to supply all berthing piers with complete utilities from shore facilities, including steam and compressed air to Pier 2, Wharf 2, and Pier 3. New systems for the distribution of potable water, steam, compressed air, fuel and fire protection, flushing and cooling water will also be provided.

At the naval air rework facility, an avionics building environmental control project will provide environmental control modifications to existing avionics work spaces to permit accurate rework of sensitive electronic navigational and communications equipment of aircraft.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$51,299,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	37,932,057
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	45,222,835

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Pier utilities	$211,812	19
Avionics building environmental control	48,400	36

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $3,827,000 for pier utilities, and $1,409,000 for avionics building environmental control.

Tell us about the realinements affecting this station other than the NARF, and detail the costs and savings which will result.

Admiral MARSCHALL. For the Naval Air Station at Alameda, the significant changes are disestablishment of Commander Fleet Air, Alameda, the relocation of fleet tactical squadrons to the air station Moffett Field, and other aviation units to the Naval Air Station, Lemoore.

Mr. SIKES. Show us on the map.

Mr. TAYLOR. Primarily the air activities are being relocated from Alameda. Part of them are going to Moffett Field which is approximately 30 miles directly south of this area. The others are relocating to Lemoore, which is approximately 100 miles over inland into the desert area of California.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Not desert. The valley area.

Mr. TAYLOR. The valley area. Excuse me.

To give you an idea from our road map, here is the San Francisco Bay area with the Naval Air Station, Alameda, located at approximately this point. The Naval Air Station, Moffett, is just north of San Jose at the southern tip of the San Francisco Bay. The Naval Air Station, Lemoore is over in the valley at this location.

Admiral MARSCHALL. That is a bit over 100 miles, Mr. Chairman. I wouldn't want to walk the rest of the way. It is more like 200 miles. Those are the relocations associated with Alameda, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. How many carriers are to be based at Alameda?

Mr. TAYLOR. Our projection is for two carriers in the future, sir, both the nuclear type CV's.

Mr. SIKES. Will you place in the record the associated costs and savings?

[The information follows:]

COSTS AND SAVINGS

The NAS Alameda complex will be generally reduced by the disestablishment of some administrative units, the relocation of some squadrons to NAS Moffett Field or NAS Lemoore and a decreased level of activity for the remaining functions. The fiscal year 1974 MILCON costs, all at NAS Moffett Field, necessitated by the above actions are as follows:

P-017	BEQ modernization	22,619 ft²	$500,000
P-402	Aircraft parking apron	Lump sum	750,000
P-403	Fuel storage	do	300,000
	Total Milcon costs		1,550,000

The above actions will reduce Navy annual expenditures by $8,076,000.

Mr. SIKES. How many other ships will be based there?

Captain WATSON. A total of nine ships will be home ported at Alameda. Seven auxiliaries and two carriers.

PIER FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Is there sufficient pier space?

Captain WATSON. Yes sir, for these ships.

Mr. SIKES. How about pier utilities?

Captain WATSON. The projects in this program, Mr. Chairman, will satisfy our requirement for pier utilities. The 1973 program had pier utilities for cold iron on pier 2 and this program has a project for pier utilities on pier 3 to do away with the present MUSE equipment.

Mr. OBEY. Would you discuss the requirements for pier utilities in the amount of $3,827,000?

Captain WATSON. This will install a boilerhouse with the boilers and a high pressure air compressor saltwater pumping station and the utilities outlets on pier 3 as well as 2 mooring platforms at the end of pier 3 to satisfy carrier berthing.

Mr. OBEY. What is the situation on waste disposal at those piers?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. In the 1973 pollution abatement program, ship waste water connections cover a large percentage of this and in the 1974 program this year we have a project to take care of the rest of it.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Are you going to award all these projects as a single item or do you propose to finish the job and come back in and dig it up again?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We will evaluate the timing of the contracts and, if possible, put them together. I don't think we have a firm plan established now, but that is our general approach.

NAVAL AIR REWORK FACILITY

Mr. OBEY. What is the projected workload for this naval air rework facility? What are the major items repaired here?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, new items being added as a result of the closure of Quonset Point by the S–3 aircraft, airframe, as well as the engine, the TF–34 engine, will be overhauled at this location.

The principal ongoing workload is the overhaul of the ASW land-based P–3 aircraft. These two aircraft overhauls at this one NARF makes this a very logical consolidation. Alameda has been also overhauling the J–52 engine and the missile component.

Mr. OBEY. Would you provide the workload for the record?

[NOTE.—For direct man-hour workload projection for NARF Alameda, refer to charts inserted on page 393 of these hearings.]

Mr. MURPHY. With regard to utilization, it has been dropping markedly between 1973 and 1974 crossing the 80 percent line. That is a logical reason for adding work.

MISSIONS TO BE TRANSFERRED

Mr. OBEY. Which items will be transferred here from Quonset Point? Is the project for environmental control in the avionics building related to this transfer?

Mr. MURPHY. From Quonset Point, we transfer rework of the S–3 aircraft and engines. The environmental control project, while not directly related to the transfer, will be providing adequate avionics work spaces needed for both P–3 and missile avionics items now in the workload here, and for the sophisticated avionics equipment to be associated with the S–3. In other words, the project's usefulness is much enhanced for the fact that increased avionics workload is being assigned.

Mr. OBEY. Will any other items be transferred there?

Mr. MURPHY. The S–3 as I mentioned. In addition, the J–65 engine would be the only other item in Quonset.

Mr. OBEY. What savings do you anticipate for the project? Provide the details for the record.

[The information follows:]

NARF ALAMEDA—ECONOMIC BENEFITS

The principal savings are derived from expansion of the existing small instrument shop, resulting in the reduction of the rework time norm and the elimination of overtime from multiple-shift use of this highly specialized shop.

Installation of environmental control will permit expansion of the crowded shop, reducing overtime and lowering the rework norm from 14.5 to 13.5 man-hours per unit.

ANNUAL SAVINGS

12,250 units/qtr.×4 qtr./yr.×1.0 hr./unit×$14.55/hr.=$713.000

The increased annual operating costs for electrical power to drive the air-conditioning equipment is offset by reduced maintenance costs in dust control and building maintenance.

The investment of $1.4 million is thus paid back after approximately 3 years of use of the new environmental control features. This would occur 5 years after construction is started.

NAVAL AIR STATION, LEMOORE, CALIF.

Mr. OBEY. Insert page I–199 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	NAVY		NAVAL AIR STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET	1451-546	LEMOORE, CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1959	KINGS FRESNO	16 MILES EAST TO HANFORD

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

West Coast homeport for light attack aircraft squadrons which include the A4 and A7 weapons systems.

Major Activities Supported:
- 14 Fleet Squadrons
- 3 Replacement Air Groups
- 3 Carrier Air Wings (Command)
- 2 Tactical Electronic Warfare Squadrons

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	714	6,274	481	116	393	20	70	0	8,068
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	610	5,714	481	53	161	20	70	0	7,109

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	18,351	5,009	108,050	113,059
b. LEASED AND EASEMENTS	# 9,350* - 11,039#	(0* - 682#)	7* - 50#	739
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				113,798
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				14,845
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				3,266
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				16,193
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				148,102

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
211.37	INTEGRATED AVIONICS SHOP	68	SF	39,048	1,933	39,048	1,933
540.10	DENTAL CLINIC	14	SF	15,960	1,333	15,960	1,333
				TOTAL	3,266		3,266

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

NAS, LEMOORE

812

NAVAL AIR STATION, LEMOORE, CALIF., $3,266,000

This all-weather master jet air station is the west coast homeport for fleet A–4 and A–7 attack squadrons, three carrier replacement air groups, three carrier air wings, and two tactical electronic warfare squadrons.

The integrated avionics shop project will provide a maintenance facility for avionics equipment. Work is presently performed in five separated buildings providing only 40 percent of the required work area. The lighting and means of controling dust in the existing building fall short of a standard needed for performing work on sensitive electronic navigation and communication equipment.

The dental clinic project will provide a new, larger facility in the operational area and convert existing space in the hospital to hospital usage.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$112, 315, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	103, 835, 398
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	107, 344, 682

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Integrated avionics shop	$94, 480	19
Dental clinic	50, 000	20

Mr. OBEY. Will there be no additional construction required here as a result of the aircraft and personnel relocating here from Alameda?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. No, sir, there won't be.

Admiral MARSCHALL. There are no projects currently planned in either 1974 or 1975. We know of none which would be associated with the base realinement.

Mr. OBEY. You are requesting an integrated avionics shop at a cost of $1,933,000. You rate this project as 68 in the bottom 20 percent of your priority list. What are you currently using for avionics repair here?

Mr. TAYLOR. Presently, our avionics is located in five separate buildings that meet only 40 percent of the total avionics space requirement. These spaces are poorly lighted and have no environmental controls. It requires duplication of supply functions, transportation, and supervision as a result of this separation.

Mr. OBEY. How much savings can you show from this project, or do you feel there will be substantial savings?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, we have not done an economic analysis. However, because of the things I mentioned a bit earlier in the area of duplication, it seems as though there should be.

Mr. OBEY. Would you supply for the record the long-range loading for the installation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, we will.

[The information follows:]

LONG RANGE PROGRAM

NAS Lemoore is one of the Navy's newest and finest air stations. Construction began 1958, with air operations commencing in 1961. It is the west coast homeport for all light jet attack aircraft. The station's present loading includes three deployable A–4, Skyhawk squadrons, 15 deployable A–7 Corsair II squadrons,

along with training squadrons and the electronic warfare squadron being relocated from NAS Alameda.

The projected fiscal year 1978 base loading is for ——— A–7 light attack squadrons, and ——— training squadrons.

Mr. DAVIS. Where is Lemoore?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is located here in the valley section of California. It is not too far from Fresno.

Mr. DAVIS. Is this an isolated location?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is in this valley of California.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is a great agricultural center of California. There is a great deal of cotton farming and a variety of other farming in that area, cattle growing. It is a beautiful area. It is remote from the centers of activity of California. For example, I think it is roughly 200 miles from San Francisco and 200 miles from Los Angeles. It is a good area for this type of operation.

Mr. DAVIS. Is there a substantial urban center in the area?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think Fresno is the largest city nearby. The city of Hanford, Calif., which is rather small, is close by. As a matter of fact, there was some discussion as to whether it would be Naval Air Station Lenmoore or Naval Air Station Hanford. It is that close.

Mr. DAVIS. They have to be pretty well self-sustaining right there on the base.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. There is some community support, but, as you could devise from the location, it is rather minimal.

Mr. DAVIS. The long-range prospect here as far as personnel is concerned, does tend to indicate some decrease. What is the explanation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, this is a result of our going from our present number of aircraft carriers down to a 12-carrier force level. The realinement of aircraft squadrons to match the lower 12-carrier force level.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

NAVAL AIR STATION MOFFETT FIELD, CALIF.

Mr. OBEY. Turn to Naval Air Station, Moffett Field.

Insert page I–202 in the record, please.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
3 APR 1973	NAVY		NAVAL AIR STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET	1451-609	MOFFETT FIELD, CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1933	SANTA CLARA SAN MATEO	1 MILE SOUTHWEST TO MOUNTAIN VIEW

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provides training of air and ground crews, maintenance of aircraft, and a pool of aircraft and squadrons from which detachments are deployed to forward areas in the Pacific.

Major Function:
West Coast homeport for antisubmarine warfare aircraft

Major Activities Supported
Antisubmarine Patrol Squadrons
Replacement Air Group
Reserve Training Detachment
Fleet Tactical Support Squadron

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 December 1972	767	3,819	1,019	108	218	67	132	0	6,130
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	800	4,339	1,028	122	300	67	132	0	6,788

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,140	2,090	47,059	49,149
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	37* - 188#	(0* - 2#)	0	2
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				49,151
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				5,720
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				5,265
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				3,700
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				63,836

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
112.10	TAXIWAY OVERLAY	72	LS	-	2,115	-	2,115
113.20	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	/	SY	41,250	750	41,250	750
121.10	FUEL STORAGE	/	LS	-	300	-	300
211.37	AVIONICS SHOP	/	SF	34,300	1,600	34,300	1,600
721.11	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	/	SF	22,619	500	22,619	500
				TOTAL	5,265		5,265

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, CA., $5,265,000

The station is the primary west coast anti-submarine warfare patrol base air station.

The taxiway overlay project will provide a taxiway and holding area of sufficient strength to support current operations.

The aircraft parking apron project will provide adequate parking space for the relocation of fleet operational squadrons from the Naval Air Station, Alameda. The project will provide parking space for 9 patrol or reconnaissance aircraft.

The fuel storage project will upgrade the existing direct fueling system to achieve a design flow rate of 600 gallons per minute and modify the system to provide recirculation thereby making provision for cleaning the fuel of water, impurities and contaminators.

The avionics shop project will provide a maintenance facility for avionics equipment. Work is currently being conducted in inadequately sized wooden, WW II facilities with no environmental or dust controls.

The enlisted quarters modernization project will provide 72 adequate spaces for personnel of reconnaissance cargo squadrons being relocated from Naval Air Station, Alameda.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$26,895,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	21,677,728
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	24,423,228

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Taxiway overlay	$17,230	33
Aircraft shop	84,578	24
Fuel storage	14,400	0
Avionics shop	76,800	10
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization	24,000	0

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NAS, Moffett Field, California

1. Effective BEQ requirement	1921
2. Adequate Assets	
Installations	912
Community	322
3. Deficit	687
4. Fiscal Year 1974 Project	72
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	615

Mr. OBEY. What aircraft are you transferring here, and why is this the best place for them?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, as a result of the base realinement there will be a relocation of fleet tactical support squadrons 30 and 21 to this station from Alameda. This relocation has enhanced a longstanding requirement for the three projects we are requesting: the BEQ modernization for $500,000, the parking apron for $750,000, and fuel storage for $300,000.

In 1975 there will probably be two more projects at a total cost of about $2.8 million. In addition, there are two other projects in the fiscal year 1974 program which are not related to the base realinement program. One is the taxiway overlay and the other, the avionics shop both of which were requirements prior to the base realinement.

Mr. OBEY. Could you show us on the map where the taxiway overlay in the amount of $2,115,000 is to be located?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. This is the general runway area.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just to orient you, sir, this is the east side of the area where our operational squadrons are located. They use the two hangars. We have one additional hangar on the west side of the field used primarily for our replacement air group training, but our operational squadrons are mostly located on the east side.

This is the taxiway area that they use to get to the runways and it has deteriorated to the point that we are afraid an aircraft is going to actually go through the pavement.

Mr. OBEY. Why would you rate this project at a priority of 72? I take it, in the light of that last statement, that you don't think it could be delayed.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We could probably continue to patch it but sooner or later there is going to be a catastrophe.

Mr. OBEY. Provide for the record the average number of P–3s actually located at the base in the last year.

[The information follows:]

P–3 BASE LOADING

In calendar year 1972, the base loading of P–3 aircraft at NAS Moffett Field was seven deployable squadrons, a training squadron, and a reserve squadron, totaling 92 aircraft. Two squadrons of nine aircraft each are always deployed, leaving onboard count of 74–3 aircraft.

Mr. OBEY. What are you currently using for an avionics shop here?

Mr. TAYLOR. We are currently using the lean-to of one of the old lighter-than-air hangars. This space has no environmental control. It is separated from the main hangar area by only wire mesh which allows dust and dirt to come into these spaces from working on aircraft in the hangar area.

It is just a completely unsatisfactory situation for work on electronic gear.

Mr. DAVIS. Where is Moffett located with relation to some of these other facilities we have been talking about?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It is at the bottom of the bay area near Sunnyvale.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is just a bit below Palo Alto if you are familiar with this, Mr. Davis; right down from San Francisco. As a matter of fact, it is right where the peninula ends. That is the end of the bay.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it located on the bay?

Admiral MARSCHALL. At the bottom tip of the bay, yes, sir. The little town of Mountain View is just to the west of it.

HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. OBEY. Next is Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco. Insert page I–213 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	NAVY		HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL SHIP SYSTEMS COMMAND	5867-730	SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1941	SAN FRANCISCO	WITHIN CITY

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

This Shipyard provides logistic support for assigned ships, including conversion, overhaul repair, alterations and dry docking of surface ships and diesel submarines; support for weapons systems air warfare, anti-air warfare, anti-submarine warfare; support for approximately 5 carriers homeported at Alameda. Effective June 1974 this shipyard will be placed in caretaker status and will then provide only for emergency repair of aircraft carriers at Drydock 4 when required.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL (9)
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	
a. AS OF 31 December 1972	58	106	5,607	0	2	167	2,219	0	8,159
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	979	5,087	106,828	111,915
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	(0)	8* - 0#	8
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				111,923
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				21,079
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				250
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				21,806
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				155,058

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
213.90	DRY DOCK SUPPORT FACILITY	-	SF	50,000	250	50,000	250

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., $250,000

The shipyard is scheduled to be closed and placed in a caretaker status, with the exception of drydock No. 4 which will be retained to provide drydocking facilities for the emergency repair of aircraft carriers.

The drydock support facility project will provide the necessary shop facilities to support drydocking of carriers in drydock No. 4.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$27,971,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	25,242,238
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	25,372,520

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Drydock support facility	$12,000	0

CLOSURE PLANS

Mr. OBEY. Discuss in detail your plans for the closure of shipyard activities here and transfer of administrative functions to other shipyards.

Captain GINN. Mr. Chairman, the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard will be closed. We will retain in an active status, drydock No. 4, and support facilities with it, the area around the regunning mole that is currently being used in developing the Trident missile the area on pier 1 where we are conducting explosive research, and building 813 to house a number of naval activities that will be retained in the San Francisco area. The rest of the property will be declared surplus and put up for disposal with the proviso that the character of the shipyard cannot be changed by the end user.

Mr. SIKES. What does that mean, the character can't be changed?

Captain GINN. It has been interpreted that the property must remain a shipyard. The user can't fill up a drydock or tear down a building. It must remain in a condition that would allow the Navy to reopen the shipyard and use it for naval ship repair in case of a national emergency.

Mr. SIKES. Would it be retained in the reserve category for the Navy or will it be offered for sale for private shipyard use?

Captain GINN. It is my understanding it will be offered for use by private shipyards, but we will retain a recapture clause.

CONTINUED OPERATIONS

Mr. OBEY. What continued use do you plan to make of the facilities? Explain how this will be done, especially with regard to obtaining or retaining qualified personnel to carry out the mission.

Captain GINN. Is this related to the drydock 4 operation?

Mr. OBEY. Whatever operations you are keeping at the shipyard and whatever continuing work you will have there. What is going on? How are you going to do it?

Captain GINN. The only ship related industrial function will be the emergency use of drydock No. 4.

Mr. OBEY. How often would you expect to do that?

Captain GINN. Once a year at most. It is for emergency use. The people who will operate this drydock will be on Mare Island rolls.

Mr. SIKES. They will have other duties?

Captain GINN. Yes, sir. Their duties there will be to maintain the equipment, the dock, the pumps, and when we have a ship in there additional people will come over from Mare Island to assist in the work. The supervisor of shipbuilding, 12th Naval District, is looking at commercial support similar to what we do in San Diego as a possible means of supporting the bay area carriers.

SAVINGS AND COSTS OF CLOSURE

Mr. OBEY. What savings and costs are you talking about then as a result of this whole operation?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, the estimated annual savings at Hunters Point Shipyard are $17,883,000. One-time closure cost is $21.585 million.

IMPACT OF CLOSURE

Mr. OBEY. What opportunity will be given to shipyard personnel to transfer to other Navy jobs? What numbers of personnel do you expect will transfer or will find other jobs?

Captain GINN. I will have to furnish the number for the record, Mr. Chairman. I haven't that figure with me. It is changed on a daily basis. However, every employee who has permanent civil service status was screened to determine his interest in further Government employment and if he was interested, whether he had any restrictions as to areas he would go to. This information then was gathered and was retained for use in the yard. We have sent recruiting teams from the other shipyards where we have shortages of personnel, to Hunters Point.

[The information follows:]

PERSONNEL STUDY

The Department of Defense policy on stability of employment for career employees guarantees personnel affected by base closures priority rights to vacancies in other Defense activities, priority for reemployment, and payment of travel and transportation expenses for those who relocate to Defense activities in other areas. In addition, the Naval Ship Systems Command froze all vacancies in other naval shipyards on the date the closures were announced. All activities of the command were required to determine the availability of Hunters Point or Boston Naval Shipyard employees for relocation before they could fill vacancies through any other source.

At the present time, each of the other naval shipyards is seeking additional personnel. A large number of openings exist at Puget Sound, Long Beach, and Norfolk. The other naval shipyards have sent recruiting teams to Hunters Point and Boston. The outplacement offices established at these two locations indicate that several of the shipyards are making repeat visits, and it is anticipated that onsite recruitment efforts will continue.

The latest figures from Hunters Point show that as of July 13, 1973, 1,469 employees had accepted offers to transfer to other naval shipyards. (It should be noted that not all of these transfers have been made as yet, since reporting dates are scheduled over the next several months.) Another 200 employees have accepted offers to other naval activities. Some 312 employees have accepted offers from other Federal activities and another 158 employees have accepted offers from private industry and local government. In total, over 2,100 Hunters Point employees have accepted outplacement offers. Several thousand additional

job opportunities have been and are being publicized at Hunters Point, however. At this point, there are two or three times as many openings as there are personnel willing to accept the jobs.

An even greater reluctance to relocate to other Federal installations or accept placement in local private industry is being evidenced by personnel at the Boston Naval Shipyard. As of July 15, 1973, just under 500 employees had accepted placement offers. This includes some 300 who moved to other naval shipyards, about 130 employees accepted work in private industry, and the balance moved to other Federal installations. Almost 1,800 Boston employees have elected to retire rather than accept placement since the closure of the shipyard was announced. Job opportunities in both Government and private industry continue to be announced, however, with a very small rate of acceptances

In summary, it is impossible to anticipate the total number of personnel who will transfer to other jobs since there are many more jobs available than there are personnel from the closing shipyards willing to accept placement.

Mr. OBEY. Does the Navy have an estimate of the economic impact on the community of the closure and if you do will you provide it for the record?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, I don't know if we have one, but if we have one, we will certainly provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

The probable direct consequence of the proposed closure of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard will be the socio-economic impact of reduced Federal expenditures in the contiguous San Francisco area. A preliminary estimate of reduced operation and maintenance costs, including civilian and military salaries, is set at $116 million. The major portion of this reduction is attributable to the relocation and elimination of more than 5,000 civilian jobs.

The impact on the surrounding community will be the reduction of expenditures for salaries, operations, construction, and school aid. Because of the Civil Service Commission's efforts to seek out and provide job opportunities to affected employees, exact expenditure reductions cannot be accurately forecasted.

Mr. OBEY. Are there questions?

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD, VALLEJO, CALIF.

Mr. OBEY. Insert page I-217 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	NAVY		MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	6. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	5. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL SHIP SYSTEMS COMMAND	5867-720	VALLEJO, CALIFORNIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1854	SOLANO	WITHIN CITY

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

This Shipyard provides logistic support for assigned ships including conversion, overhaul, repair, alterations and drydocking of surface ships (except carriers and modern submarines; new construction of attack and fleet ballistic submarines; support for submarine warfare weapons systems.

Major Function:
Overhaul of surface ships (except carriers) and modern submarines

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 72	49	1	7,682	0	0	11	0	310	8,053
b. PLANNED (End FY 1979)	57	28	8,469	0	0	11	0	310	8,865

INVENTORY				
LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	3,457	1,149	131,262	132,411
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	48* - 1#	1* - 0#	153* - 0#	153
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				132,564
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				16,117
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				11,895 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				20,340
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				180,916

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
217.10	ELECTRONIC SHOP ALTERATIONS	1	SF	11,100	200	11,100	200
812.30	ELECTRICAL DISTR SYS IMPROVEMENTS (1ST INCR)	1	LS	-	1,874	-	1,874
				TOTAL	2,074		2,074

1/ INCLUDES $ 9,821,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD, VALLEJO, CALIF., $2,074,000

This shipyard performs work in connection with alterations, drydockings, and outfitting of ships and crafts; and refueling of nuclear submarines and surface craft other than carriers. In addition, this yard services submarine warfare systems both nuclear attack and Polaris.

The electronics shop alterations project will provide facilities to accommodate the expanded workload created by the planned closure of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard.

The electrical distribution system project will improve the existing system by partially replacing obsolete equipment and worn cable and will install a new control system. The existing system is unreliable and of insufficient capacity.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$39,649,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	27,754,843
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	30,496,395

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Electronic shop alterations	$9,600	0
Electrical distribution systems improvements (1st increment)	93,151	8

Mr. OBEY. What projects will be required here as a result of realinements?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, the project which we had indicated for $200,000, the electronic shop alterations, is no longer required as a result of a recent evaluation of this particular workload?

Mr. SIKES. What is the amount?

Admiral MARSCHALL. $200,000, Mr. Chairman. That would have been the only project associated with base realinement.

Mr. OBEY. Could you discuss for the record the relocation of activities from Mare Island and the costs and savings involved?

Abmiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

RELOCATION COSTS AND SAVINGS

The relocation of functions from the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., is very limited in nature. The Paint, Rubber and Project Chemistry (except battery charging) Laboratories will be consolidated with the Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Annapolis Laboratory, Annapolis, Md. This will result in the separation of approximately 20 people and the relocation of approximately 47 people. The one-time costs associated with this action is estimated to be $1,412,000. The estimated annual savings resulting from this action is $352,000. The only construction generated by the relocation of functions from Mare Island has been submitted to ASD (I. & L.) for funding as an urgent minor construction project in the amount of $300,000. This project will provide facilities for the laboratories.

There is, however, a non-SER related transfer pending within the Mare Island complex which will generate a MILCON project. The Nuclear Power School, a tenant of the Naval Support Activity, Mare Island, is planned for transfer to the Service School Command, Naval Training Center (SSCMDNTC), Orlando, Fla., upon successful completion of the current phase 1 project in the fiscal year 1974 program and further completion of a phase 2 project currently being planned for fiscal year 1975. The amount of the second increment is $4,600,000.

Mr. SIKES. Has that change in your budget request been transmitted to this committee?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir, it has not been.

Mr. OBEY. Could you explain the seeming reduction in the number of people supported as shown on the 1390's for fiscal years 1973 and 1974? Last year it showed 5 or 6,000 people in the support category. This year it shows 310 people. That is not just a transfer between permanent and supporting?

Captain GINN. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I will have to furnish that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The reduction in people supported by the Mare Island Naval Shipyard shown by a comparison of the 1390 forms submitted for fiscal years 1973 and 1974 was brought about by the establishment of the Naval Support Activity, Mare Island. Previously the Mare Island Naval Shipyard has totally supported personnel off ships in the yard for overhaul as well as the various tenant commands on Mare Island including the Combat Systems Technical Schools Command, the Naval Nuclear Power School, the Naval Inshore Operations Training Center, the Naval Electronics Systems Command, Western Division, and the Naval Inactive Ship Maintenance Facility. With the establishment of the Naval Support Activity, Mare Island, the bulk of the support effort for personnel off ships and tenant commands was transferred to that activity.

The planned increases in "permanent" personnel are based on anticipated workload increases.

WORKLOAD

Mr. OBEY. What additional workload, in terms of mission and man-years, will this shipyard receive?

Captain GINN. Mr. Chairman, with the closure of Hunters Point, Mare Island will get the overhaul of two diesel submarines at around 60,000 man-days and some cryptographic repair work.

Mr. NICHOLAS. What will be the effect of the closure of Hunters Point? Will there be a relocation of some of the other major repair work from there and its transfer to Puget Sound? That in turn would probably require the transfer of some submarine work or whatever from Puget Sound to Mare Island. Is there no additional workload being transferred other than those diesel subs?

Captain GINN. Hunters Point workload will be divided between Long Beach and Puget Sound for surface work, Mare Island for diesel submarine work, and the work that will be done in San Francisco Bay, by the commercial shipbuilders. Our shipyard closures were predicated on the basis that we had excess capacity within the total naval shipyard complex.

Mr. OBEY. Would you discuss the requirements for electronics shop alterations?

Captain GINN. Mr. Chairman, that is the project we have withdrawn.

Mr. OBEY. Let me go back a moment. What would the annual average nuclear submarine repair work at Mare Island be for the next 5 years?

Captain GINN. I will have to furnish that for the record.

[The information follows:]

SUBMARINE REPAIR WORKLOAD

The annual average nuclear submarine repair work for Mare Island for the next 5 years is two to three nuclear attack and/or fleet ballistic missile submarine overhaul starts per year and two nuclear attack submarine selected restricted availability starts per year.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You are capable of doing three submarines there simultaneously?

Captain GINN. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Will it approximate that level?

Captain GINN. I am sure it will.

Mare Island's end of year ceiling is 6,800. The next year it will go to 7,100 so basically it will remain about the same.

ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. OBEY. What is involved in the electrical distribution system improvements? What later increments will there be?

Captain GINN. The project that is before you now, Mr. Chairman, modifies 11 of our present substations and adds three additional ones. It updates the primary distribution system to 12 KVA. We will replace a considerable amount of the primary cable. We will install new ducts with manholes and we will install metering equipment, fire alarm equipment, and outlets in this increment. This will be followed by two additional increments. The next increment then will handle the secondary of the distribution system and remove the type of distribution that we have now. We have a double transformation in our secondary system. We will go to a single transformation in that system. This will then distribute to the piers.

The third increment will be an improvement to the DC system.

Mr. DAVIS. I take it there is no relation between this electronic shop alteration which has been scrapped and the electrical distribution system?

Captain GINN. None whatsoever, sir.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. OBEY. Insert page II–1 in the record.

[The page follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization		Appropriation	
	Project Amount	Installation Total	Project Amount	Installation Total
THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT				
State of Alaska				
Naval Complex, Adak				
Naval Communication Station, Adak (NAVCOMMCOM)				
P-716 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10-136 MN) (24,840 SF)	2,695		2,695	
Naval Station, Adak (PACFLT)				
P-053 Runway and Taxiway Overlay (111.10-212,560 SY)	4,158		4,158	
Navy Commissary Store (CNM)				
P-062 Commissary (740.23-20,585 SF)	1,920		1,920	
		8,773		8,773
State of Washington				
Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton (CNM)				
P-437 Electric Distribution System (2nd Incr) (812.30-LS)	1,954		1,954	
P-412 Crane Track Connection (860.40-LS)	346		346	
		2,300		2,300
TOTAL - THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT		11,073		11,073

RELOCATIONS

Mr. OBEY. Will you discuss the relocation actions to Bremerton and Keyport, and indicate for the record if there will be any construction required as a result? Also indicate the total savings from these actions.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, the relocations involve quality evaluation functions that we now conduct in Hawaii at the Naval Ammunition Depot in Oahu.

We propose to bring that function back to the mainland.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is a very small number of people, as I recall.

With regard to the impact of a base realinement, there will be no projects required. The gain in number of employees at the shipyard will be roughly 800, but there is no significant change there.

With respect to Keyport, sir, we are talking about 800 and a total of 8,000. It is a 10-percent increase roughly.

Mr. MCKAY. That is a pretty good increase.

Admiral MARSCHALL. At keyport, the number of civilian positions involved will be about 90.

Mr. OBEY. Could you provide for the record the ships and personnel that are coming in, and the ship being transferred to Bremerton?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I don't know of any ships——

Mr. NICHOLAS. See if there are for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have an oiler type vessel to be relocated into the Bremerton Area.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will provide the information for the record.

[The information follows:]

TRANSFER OF SHIP TO SEATTLE AREA

As a result of the Long Beach closure, one fast combat support ship (AOE) will be relocated to the Seattle area. This will result in an increase at Bremerton of 29 officers and 614 men.

Mr. OBEY. Did you mention what the savings would be? Put it in the record.

[The information follows:]

RELOCATION SAVINGS

The estimated annual savings of $3 million from the closing of Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, stem chiefly from the reduction of approximately 240 civilian positions. No substantial savings will result from the relocation of other positions to NTS Keyport since the activity operations cost at either location would be about the same.

NAVAL COMPLEX, ADAK, ALASKA

Mr. OBEY. Insert page II–2 in the record.

[The page follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMPLEX

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	VARIOUS	ADAK, ALASKA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1943	ALEUTIAN ISLANDS	1,200 MILES NORTHEAST TO ANCHORAGE

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the operating forces of the Navy; provide Fleet broadcasts, tactical ship-to-shore and point-to-point communications in support of the Defense Communication System for surface ships and submarines operating in the Alaskan area.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 1972	125	1,831	303	0	0	101	357	39	2,756
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	128	1,907	309	0	0	111	283	52	2,790

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	79,300	0	161,540	161,540
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	(0)	152* - 0#	152
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				161,692
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				21,687
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				8,773
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				15,137
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				207,289

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
	NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION						
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	42 -	SF	24,840	2,695	24,840	2,695
	NAVAL STATION						
111.10	RUNWAY AND TAXIWAY OVERLAY	46 -	SY	212,560	4,158	212,560	4,158
	NAVY COMMISSARY STORE						
740.23	COMMISSARY	69 -	SF	20,585	1,920	20,585	1,920
				TOTAL	8,773		8,773

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Naval Complex, Adak, AK., $8,773,000

This complex provides a strategically located installation for the deployment of P-3 anti-submarine warfare aircraft, and for operating communication facilities that support Naval operating forces.

Naval Communication Station, Adak, AK

The bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project will provide modern living spaces for 136 men currently living in overcrowded substandard quarters.

Naval Station, Adak, AK

The runway and taxiway overlay project will upgrade existing pavements to sustain modern P-3 ASW patrol aircraft. The existing pavements constructed in 1944 are not capable of sustaining the current load of operational aircraft without suffering damage and continuing deterioriation.

Naval Commissary Store , Adak, AK

The commissary project will provide a new facility to replace the existing substandard, structurally deteriorated facility which is too small to adequately serve the families of the Naval Complex, Adak.

Status of funds:

Cumualtive appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$94,457,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	90,436,010
Cumualtive obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	93,709,648

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters	$134,972	9
Runway and taxiway overlay	29,038	43
Commissary	21,916	35

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NC, Adak, Alaska

1.	**Effective BEQ requirement**	452
2.	**Adequate Assets**	75
	Installation	75
	Community	-0-
3.	**Deficit**	377
4.	**Fiscal Year 1974 project**	136
5.	**Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974**	241

Mr. OBEY. How long is the tour of duty at Adak?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, for the accompanied person the tour is 18 months and for the unaccompanied person 12 months.

Mr. OBEY. What is the area cost factor here?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Three, sir.

Mr. OBEY. What are you currently using for bachelor enlisted quarters spaces at the communications station?

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, at the communications station we have some permanent construction, permanently constructed barracks, two of which were built in 1950, one in 1960, one in 1968. The one barracks that accommodates 22 people is an old wooden World II type construction that cannot be modernized.

RUNWAY AND TAXIWAY OVERLAY

Mr. OBEY. Is the current runway and taxi situation hazardous?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, we conducted an evaluation of all our airfield pavements in the Pacific area and it turned out that the runway at Adak was in the worst condition of any airfield in the Pacific area. It is at the point where it cannot be continually patched to keep it operational.

Mr. OBEY. Then why do you rank the project in the lower 10 percent of this year's program?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, again I think we are gambling. It is the numbers game we fight in this proposition. As I have said so often, it takes a great deal of justification to get something this far—to the Congress, through the Navy and DOD systems.

Mr. OBEY. If it is the worst, we would think it would be ranked higher than that.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have to balance it off against other requirements in the Navy.

Mr. OBEY. You say you are gambling. If it is hazardous, wouldn't you think it would rank higher than some of the other projects which don't necessarily imply danger to life and limb?

Admiral MARSCHALL. My Obey, when you talk about a runway, you talk about something you can patch, patch, patch. As I mentioned previously with respect to Moffett Field, you do it until you have a catastrophe. It is just a calculated risk to put it this far down the priority chain. We can manage to keep up generally, but this one is really reducing itself to nonrepairability.

Mr. OBEY. I am new on this subcommittee and admittedly I am not familiar with many of these items, but I would think it would rank higher than that.

Provide for the record the average number of P–3 aircraft that have been deployed at this station in the past year and show what is projected.

[The information follows:]

AIRCRAFT SUPPORTED AT ADAK

The Naval Station, Adak, Alaska, presently provides support for a deployed detachment of 3 P–3 aircraft. This loading will not change in the next few years.

COMMISSARY

Mr. OBEY. What are you currently using for a commissary here?

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, the present commissary was originally built in World War II as a warehouse. It is badly deteriorated, due to old age, and the severe weather conditions it is subjected to. I have some pictures here sometimes classified as horror pictures, showing the outside of the building and some of the conditions inside the building, showing the deterioration of the wood structure. This is the only commissary and the only other local accommodations are some 1,500 miles away.

MAINTENANCE REQUIRED

Mr. MCKAY. These buildings deteriorate and they have their problems, but what kind of maintenance money do you put into our existing buildings to allay some deterioration?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, unfortunately we just haven't had enough maintenance money in recent years. The chairman, Mr. Sikes, has supported us tremendously in this area, but in balancing the Navy needs we seem not to get as much as we feel as engineers we require, for base maintenance.

Mr. MCKAY. I went out on a trip with the committee a year ago to examine the need for a new building and it became completely evident to me that 90 percent of the problem was due to the fact that they hadn't put any maintenance in the old one and they were losing the roof. If they had done a little maintenance on that roof, it would have been a good building for years to come. You get a new building and operate it until it collapses, rather than providing a little maintenance to keep it from having to be replaced.

We say "Well, it was a 50-year-old building or a 60-year-old building." We have had buildings that with proper maintenance are 50 and 100 years old that are still in good repair. They may not be the most modern operationally but they are good, solid buildings. It seems we have a lot of these deteriorating at a very rapid rate, much more so than they should. I would like to know if it is because of lack of a proper maintenance program.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We do our best with the funds we have, Mr. McKay.

Mr. MCKAY. Could you give us some figures on what you might be able to save if your maintenance funds were increased, versus rebuilding, that type of thing?

Admiral MARSCHALL. To be perfectly honest, I doubt that I could give you a broad picture answer to that question. We could on specifics indicate what we could do to save useful life.

Mr. MCKAY. Don't you have figures in the department on that, in relation to what you replace or don't replace?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We do our best to do that, but I think on a broad-gage basis I could not tell you how many buildings we could save by pumping more maintenance into them because when you talk about this you really ought to talk about specifics.

I can tell you what our backlog of essential maintenance is. It is high. I can tell you what we are getting and how we are going about trying to maintain the structures we have and the facilities—not just structures.

Again, the requirements for new facilities are in the main generated by new requirements, new criteria, new modes and standards of living.

For example, a barracks. We have attempted in many ways to save as many of the old structures as we can, and we do perform an economic analysis each time we want to bring up to standards the living conditions at a particular base.

If we can use the existing facility economically, we do everything in our power to do that.

On this point, however, it is not a question of, did we put enough money into it to maintain it over the years. Our standards have changed. We now no longer think it is good enough to have gangheads for sailors. We have an individual head for each room. We need air-conditioning. Sometimes you can't accommodate an old building to air-conditioning along with the increased numbers of heads which require a great deal of mechanical-type construction. We make economic studies on these every time we go into it.

So to tell you I could come up with a figure saying if I had more dollars of maintenance money, I could come to you with less dollars of new capital investment money, I think would be very difficult. I think I could take some cases and try to point out where additional money applied judicially would extend the life of individual structures. I hope you see what I am getting at here.

Mr. McKay. I understand the change in requirements, but I think we are probably wasting many dollars simply because we don't take care of things.

COMMISSARY SALES

Mr. Obey. Would you provide for the record the number of personnel who are here on accompanied and unaccompanied tours and what the monthly sales are?

Admiral Marschall. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

ADAK PERSONNEL LOAD

The number of military personnel at NS Adak on accompanied and unaccompanied tours are as follows:

	Accompanied	Unaccompanied
Officer	89	29
Enlisted:		
E1–E3	40	742
E4–E9	562	459
Total	691	1,230

Average monthly sales for the Navy Commissary Store at Adak, based on the first 9 months of fiscal year 1973, are $120,779 in cash register sales.

MAINTENANCE FLOOR

Mr. Davis. It is true for a number of years there has been carried in the defense appropriation bill a floor on the amount to be used for maintenance of real estate. Somewhere along the line, the armed services have had a poor enough record in that regard that somebody had

to take the bit in their teeth and say, "You have to spend at least this much."

Admiral MARSCHALL. That is correct, sir, and we do in each year's program have a so-called maintenance floor which obviously, as you have noted, Mr. McKay, hasn't satisfied all the requirements.

As a matter of interest, the Chief of Naval Operations has become alarmed about the status of the shore facilities and has reprogramed within Navy, before it ever gets to the Congress, money from the military construction program into base operations support. I think there is now a general awareness of just what you have spoken of, but again it is going to take a great infusion of money to do the maintenance we really should do.

Mr. MCKAY. I think that it really takes some analysis.

I know that in a church I belong to, for years they went along on the same basis. "We will repair it when we get around to it." But after detailed analysis, they have gone into a major maintenance operation in which they have set out times and seasons for waxing floors, for repainting, for the work program and they figure they have come up with replacement costs reduced considerably. I can't give the figure here.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. McKay, we have just such a program in the Navy. Unfortunately it has been underfunded and we haven't followed it up.

Now, with this base realinement which is taking place, we hope that we can devote more of our dollars to the maintenance and upkeep of the remaining facilities. We hope that with these savings that we make by base closures we can eventually bring up the standards of maintenance of the remaining bases.

Mr. MCKAY. I got the impression as I went out on this trip that, although they had funds they might use for maintenance, they would

rather shift them to things they liked rather than things they needed.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. McKay, I think if you would look at our recent performance in the Navy, you will find that rather than take money which was earmarked originally for base maintenance, to do other things, the converse has been true. There has been a great awareness by commanding officers, who have various types of money to administer, that their bases are in tough enough shape, so they are diverting other types of money into base maintenance.

Mr. MCKAY. If that is the attitude of the base commanders, then are they being overruled by the commands on high as they send up their requests for more maintenance money?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think it is a natural thing when you have times of limited budgets that the man at the top must make decisions as to how he will spend these limited dollars.

Admiral Zumwalt has embarked on a program to give us the Navy of the future.

Mr. MCKAY. Does that provide the priorities?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKAY. The Navy of the future does not mean maintenance of what you have, that means a new ball game.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Well, I think he is doing a very delicate balancing act, doing it well, and we are certainly trying to support him. But there are these questions of both Navy and national priorities which he must balance.

PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD, BREMERTON, WASH.

Mr. OBEY. Turn to Pugent Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.

Insert page II–6 into the record.

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	NAVY		PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL SHIP SYSTEMS COMMAND	5867-150	BREMERTON, WASHINGTON

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1891	KITSAP	WITHIN CITY

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

This shipyard provides logistic support for assigned ships including conversion, overhaul, repair, alterations and drydocking of surface ships and modern submarines; surface ships new construction; support for weapons systems air and submarine warfare.

Major Function:
Maintenance and overhaul of surface ships (up to and including attack carriers) and attack and fleet ballistic missile submarines

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	64	121	7,994	0	0	255	1,615	1,112	11,161
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	72	144	9,045	0	0	230	1,880	580	11,951

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	1,065	2,823	128,058	130,881
b. LEASED AND EASEMENTS	25* - 5#	(0* - 1#)	371	372
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				131,253
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				28,304
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				13,603 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				40,176
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				233,336

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
812.30	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (2ND INCR)	9 -	LS	-	1,954	-	1,954
860.40	CRANE TRACK CONNECTION	49 -	LS	-	346	-	346
				TOTAL	2,300		2,300

1/ INCLUDES $11,303,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

DD FORM 1 OCT 73 1390

PUGET SOUND, NAVAL SHIPYARD, BREMERTON, WASH., $2,300,000

This shipyard provides surface ship new construction and overhaul of all types of ships including aircraft carriers, frigates, and submarines.

The electrical distribution system project is the second increment of upgrading and replacement of the antiquated and undersized existing system.

The crane track connection project will provide a transfer track between two drydocks to permit the efficient and economical use of portable cranes which presently cannot move freely from point to point in the yard.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$68, 941, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	58, 952, 761
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	63, 699, 310

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Electrical distribution system (2d increment)	$111, 141	8
Crane track connection	11, 041	65

EFFECT OF TRIDENT ON SHIPYARD WORKLOAD

Mr. OBEY. What effect do you expect the Trident to have upon your total workload projections here? What effect do you expect from the base realinements?

Captain GINN. The Trident workload, Mr. Chairman, obviously is not detailed yet. The cycle for the overhaul of those submarines is something like 8 to 9 years, which means it will be that long before the first one after it is built is seen in the yard under the dedicated-base concept. Exactly what will be done in the way of the repair of the rotatables or the replaceable items and where they will be repaired has not been worked out. It is expected that they will eventually impact on the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

BASE CLOSURE IMPACT

As far as base closure is concerned, the *Enterprise* was moved from Hunters Point to Puget for overhaul. It represents about 100,000 man-days. That is all that has resulted from base closure as far as Puget Sound is concerned in fiscal year 1974.

Mr. OBEY. Do you show any savings as a result?

Captain GINN. As a result of what, sir?

Mr. OBEY. As a result of the realinement?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Obey, we have attempted to give the savings at the closing activity.

Mr. OBEY. I understand.

Admiral MARSCHALL. As we pointed out earlier, the Hunters Point Shipyard load will be distributed to other yards. The estimated annual savings, as I pointed out, at Hunters Point, were $17.8 million annually.

CRANE TRACK CONNECTION

Mr. OBEY. How urgent is the crane track connection?

Captain GINN. Very urgent.

Mr. OBEY. How often is drydock No. 1 expected to be used for extended submarine availability in the future?

Captain GINN. I would have to furnish that one for the record, Mr. Obey.

[The information follows:]

USE OF DRY DOCK NO. 1

The expected use of dry dock No. 1 at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard for extended submarine availabilities is as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Percent of utilization*
1974	92
1975	100
1976	90
1977	100
1978	80
1979	62
1980	75
1981	90
1982	100

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could you also provide for the record the savings you anticipate from the two projects here?

SAVINGS

Captain GINN. From the two that we have, yes, we will put that in the record.

[The information follows:]

NO SAVINGS PREDICTED ON ELECTRICAL PROJECT

The electrical distribution system second increment was not justified on the basis of economics. Therefore, no savings have been predicted. The work to be accomplished by this project is for capability increase with prime emphasis on developing the capability for the servicing of nuclear powered surface ships.

CRANE PROJECT SAVINGS

The savings anticipated from the project for the crane track connection is shown in the economic analysis for the project.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY INVESTMENTS, SUMMARY OF PROJECT COSTS, FORMAT A–1

1. Submitting Department of the Navy component: Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Wash.
2. Date of submission: July 1972.
3. Project title: Crane track connection.
4. Description of project objective: The objective is to provide a crane track bypass to economically move cranes between dry docks 1 and 2.
5*a*. Present alternative: Continue present operations without crane bypass.
b. Proposed alternative: Provide crane bypass between dry docks 1 and 2.
6*a*. Economic life: 15 years.
b. Economic life: 15 years.

7. Project year	8. Recurring (operations) costs (a) Present alternative	(b) Proposed alternative	9. Differential cost	10. Discount factor	11. Discounted differential cost
All years 1 to 15:					
Operating	76,500	2,000	74,500		
Overhead costs	12,000	0	12,000		
12. Total	88,500	2,000	85,500	[1] 7,980	690,270

[1] Project year discount factor, present value of $1, 15 years, 10 percent.

13. Present value of new investment:	
(a) Land and buildings	0
(b) Equipment	0
(c) Crane tracks	$346,000
(d) Working capital (change—plus or minus)	0
14. Total present value of new investment (i.e., funding requirements)	346,000
15. Less present value of existing assets replaced	0
16. Plus value of existing assets to be employed on the project	0
17. Net investment (line 14 minus line 15 plus line 16)	346,000
18. Present value of cost savings from operations (col. 11)	690,270
19. Plus present value of the cost of refurbishment or modification eliminated	0
20. Total present value of cost savings	690,270
21. Savings/investment ratio (payback) (line 20–line 17)	2

	Alternate A	Alternate B
22. Source/derivation of cost estimates:		
(a) Investment costs:		
(1) Changes in working capital	0	0
(2) Net terminal value	0	(1)
(b) Recurring cost (operations):		
(1) Personnel	0	0
(2) Operating	$76,500	$2,000
(3) Overhead costs	12,000	0
(c) Other considerations:		

[1] Negligible.

Alternate A. Cranes transferring from areas east of drydock 1 must make an 1,800-foot loop from the head of drydock 1 to reach the head of drydock 2. From this point there is connecting track in a direct route to drydocks 4, 5, and 6.

Cranes working the west side of drydock 1 and the east side of drydock 2 must be moved out of the way when cranes are transferred through. The nearest available track pocket is at the southeast end of drydock 2. When extended availabilities occur at drydock 1, no transfer of cranes is possible for a 3-month period.

Work is interrupted in both drydocks and the transferring crane crew is delayed waiting for a clear track.

Alternate B. Connect the heads of drydocks 2 and 1 with 402 lineal feet of 20-feet gage crane track.

Operating savings—Assume: (1) Crane transfer is not blocked by extended availabilities at drydock No. 1 except for 3 months each year. (2) Two cranes per day move through the existing loop drydock 1 to drydock 2. (3) A crane

crew is one operator and two riggers. (4) Average crane speed is 80 FPM (maximum varies 165 to 210 FPM). (5) Four riggers per crane are delayed in the drydock when crane is not available. (6) Crane (a) is at drydock 2, crane B is at drydock 1, and crane C is east of drydock 1.

TIME ELEMENTS: (ALTERNATE A)

Drydock 2—Crane A moves 500 ft. at 80 FPM to pocket: 6.25 minutes. Drydock 2—Crane B moves 1,000 ft. at 80 FPM to pocket: 12.5 minutes. Transferring crane C 1,800 ft. at 80 FPM to pocket: 22.5 minutes. Switching (per each switch) feet at 80 FPM to pocket: 3 minutes. Delay for working crane to complete current lift: 20 minutes.

(1) Crane C reaches head of drydock 1 and is delayed while crane B completes work. During this delay crane A moves into pocket. (2) Crane B moves past switch at pocket. (3) Switch is thrown. (4) Crane B moves into pocket. (5) Switch is thrown back. Crane C has followed crane B, waits in back of switch for crane B to get into pocket, then goes on his way to west sector. (6) Switch is thrown. (7) Crane B goes back to work. Switch is thrown and crane A returns to work. Total time required to move crane C from head of drydock 1 to head of drydock 2 is 57 minutes or say one hour per move. It is estimated, based on actual experience at the shipyard, that an average of two such moves occur daily for 300 days out of the year without crane track blockage by extended availabilities.

Alternate A operating cost

4 riggers times 2 cranes divided by 3-man crane crew times 3 cranes equals 17 men at $10 per hour times 450 moves per year times 1 hour per move	$76,500
Remove refueling structures—1 move per year	12,000
Total	88,500

Alternate B Operating Cost: 3 man crew at $10 an hour times 600 moves over a year times 0.1 hour per man, $2,000. Nonquantifiable benefits could occur as a result of this project. Under present conditions and during an extended refueling operation at drydock No. 1, it is probable that the required positioning of a critical crane cannot be effected resulting in either necessary removal and reinstallation of refueling enclosure at dry dock 1 or a delay in the schedule of critical shipyard work. One such delay could amount to several thousands of dollars. An example of such a delay could assume a ship located at a pier requires an unscheduled large crane lift with the only available cranes capable of handling this lift located on the opposite side of the track blockage or the required crane in position for a nuclear refueling. The crane involved in the refueling cannot be moved until the critical refueling lifts are accomplished. This could involve up to 3 months, depending on the span in time of the refueling operation. The large crane lift would be required to be delayed until such time as a crane is available or the ship rescheduled and moved to a pier where the appropriate crane service could be made available. A move of this type, and assuming an alternate pier is available, would delay shipboard work for the period of the move and is subject to increased costs for the unscheduled ship move. Assuming one 8-hour shift and 100 shipboard workers are involved, the cost in lost time would be approximately $8,000. Added to this would be the time required for a waterfront crew to disconnect and reconnect the ship's services plus the necessary tugs to accomplish the move. This would represent approximately $3,000, for a total of $11,000 and one day of ship availability. This example represents a minimum situation and in the event a capital ship were involved the costs could be several times more. If an unscheduled lift were to occur for a ship in drydock under similar conditions, the only alternatives would be to delay the shipboard work related to the required crane lift until a suitable crane could be made available or until such time as the ship is removed from the drydock and moved to a pier of an available crane.

Mr. OBEY. Questions?

Mr. DAVIS. Just off the record.

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. OBEY. We will resume at 10 o'clock Monday.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MONDAY, JULY 16, 1973

14TH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. SIKES. The committee will come to order.

We will begin with the 14th Naval District. Insert pages II–9 and II–10 in the record.

[The information follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILIRARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization Project Amount	Authorization Installation Total	Appropriation Project Amount	Appropriation Installation Total
FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT				
State of Hawaii				
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point (PACFLT)				
P-056 Dispensary and Dental Clinic (550.10 - 50,810 SF)	4,306	4,306	4,306	4,306
Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu (CNM)				
Waikele Branch				
P-061 Perimeter Fence and Security Culverts (872.10 - LS)	457	457	457	457
Naval Station, Pearl Harbor (PACFLT)				
P-003 Enlisted Men's Dining Facility (723.10 - 13,952 SF)	1,345		1,345	
Ford Island				
P-004 Evaluation Center (141.83 - 20,677 SF	1,870		1,870	
Naval Preventive Medicine Unit No. 6 (BUMED)				
P-600 Preventive Medicine Unit (530.20 - 11,466 SF)	845	4,060	845	4,060

1/ See Classified Book for Requirement Statement

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization		Appropriation	
	Project Amount	Installation Total	Project Amount	Installation Total
FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT				
State of Hawaii (Cont'd)				
Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor (PACFLT)				
P-015 BEQ and Mess Modernization (721.10-474 MN)(155,892 SF)	2,013		2,013	
P-034 BOQ and Mess Modernization (724.10-40,680 SF) (30MN)	549		549	
		2,562		2,562
Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor (CNM)				
P-408 Additional Utilities - Berthing Wharves (812.10-LS)	1,863		1,863	
P-412 Electrical Distribution System Improvement - Ford Island (812.30-LS)	122		122	
		1,985		1,985
Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahiawa, (NAVCOMMCOM)				
P-961 Satellite Communication Terminal (131.35- LS)	1,006		1,006	
P-115 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10-44 MN)(7,506 SF)	468		468	
P-033 VLF Antenna Modification (132.10-LS)(NRS Lualualei)	850		850	
		2,324		2,324
TOTAL - FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT		15,694		15,694

PERSONNEL RELOCATIONS

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $15,694,000. What are your plans to house the additional personnel which are being moved into this district?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There will be seven additional ships, Mr. Chairman. Of course, there will be no bachelor enlisted requirements as a result of this or bachelor officer requirement.

Mr. SIKES. What about family housing?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have a very active program in Hawaii, as you know, sir, and these new people will be considered in our surveys as we come to the Congress.

Mr. SIKES. This would indicate that you may not have taken into account the housing costs in estimating the economic benefits of realinement.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Sir, in all the considerations of base realinements, housing costs as well as other costs were considered.

Mr. SIKES. How much will the housing costs be?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

HOUSING COSTS

The married, eligible personnel assigned to the ships being homeported in Hawaii will increase our programable family housing deficit by approximately 650 units. At current costs, the construction of the entire 650 units would be $25.4 million.

Mr. SIKES. You say there will be no additional requirements for bachelor personnel. Why is that? If you base some additional ships there, there should be requirements for additional housing for personnel.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Housing for the married personnel only, Mr. Chairman. I indicated we would have no additional requirement for bachelor housing. They would be expected to live aboard the ships.

Mr. SIKES. If additional ships are based there, do you expect them to live aboard ship all the time?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. The bachelor personnel would. The ships to be moved there are one destroyer tender, one AO, one DDG, and four DE's.

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, OAHU, HAWAII

Mr. SIKES. Take up the Naval Ammunition Depot in Oahu. Insert page II–13.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL ORDNANCE SYSTEMS COMMAND	1514-675	OAHU, HAWAII

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1932	HONOLULU	19 MILES EAST TO HONOLULU

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Receive, renovate, maintain, store and issue ammunition, explosives, expendable ordnance items and/or weapons, and technical ordnance material. Perform additional tasks as directed by Commander, Naval Ordnance Systems Command

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	19	115	797	0	0	0	0	0	931
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	19	114	825	0	0	0	0	0	958

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	11,987	2,168	39,033	41,201
b. LEASED AND EASEMENTS #	0* - 6#	(0* - 0#)	393*	393
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				41,594
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				10,167
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				808 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				5,775
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				58,344

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
	WAIKELE BRANCH						
872.10	PERIMETER FENCE AND SECURITY CULVERTS	1 -	LS	-	457	-	457

1/ INCLUDES $351,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, OAHU, HAWAII, $457,000

This depot maintains, stores, and issues basic and war reserve ammunition stocks for the Pacific Fleet, operates a weapons evaluation and engineering facility, and supports explosives ordnance disposal in the Pacific.

The perimeter fence and security culverts project will improve and complete existing security features which only provide one-half of the fencing and culverts needed. Presently, trespassers can still gain access to the base undetected.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$7,016,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	6,688,601
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	6,775,572

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Perimeter fence and security culverts	$25,800	100

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $457,000 for a perimeter fence.

Is this a security measure or do you have a theft problem? What is the requirement?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is a security measure, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. DAVIS. Have you had a record of pilferage there or are you just trying to prevent it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. We have half of this activity covered with fencing now and this is the second increment to cover the total. Naturally, when you do have open areas that increases the necessity for physical security by our people.

NAVAL STATION, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

Mr. SIKES. Take up naval station at Pearl Harbor and place in the record page II–15.

[The information follows:]

NAVAL STATION PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII, $4,060,000

This station provides logistic support to Commander in Chief, Pacific, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet; a shipyard, ammunition depot, supply center, and other fleet support activities.

The enlisted men's dining facility project will provide a new messhall to replace an existing deteriorated, wooden building which is poorly located.

The evaluation center project at Ford Island has a classified mission.

The preventive medicine unit project at the Naval Preventive Medicine Unit No. 6 will provide a permanent consolidated facility to replace the existing, old, inefficient, and poorly located facilities.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$22,373,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	15,274,238
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	19,075,296

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Enlisted men's dining facility	$72,240	17
Evaluation center	10,000	30
Preventive medicine unit	46,000	1

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	NAVY		NAVAL STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET	6030-615	PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1903	HONOLULU	6.5 MILES SOUTHEAST TO HONOLULU

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide logistic support for operating forces, tenant commands and dependent activities, including Commander in Chief, Pacific; Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet; the Submarine Base, Ammunition Depot, Shipyard, Supply Center, and numerous headquarters commands and smaller activities in Hawaii. Support includes harbor and waterfront, athletic and recreational services, berthing and messing, exchange service, personnel services, other logistics and security services.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	1,917	13,415	9,537	0	0	146	445	0	25,460
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	1,549	12,623	9,537	0	0	59	108	0	23,876

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	621	531	54,208	54,739
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	(0)	837* - 11#	848
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				55,587
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				11,501
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				10,449 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				30,039
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				107,576

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
723.10	ENLISTED MEN'S DINING FACILITY	55 -	SF	13,952	1,345	13,952	1,345
	FORD ISLAND						
141.83	EVALUATION CENTER	1 -	SF	20,677	1,870	20,677	1,870
	NAVAL PREVENTIVE MEDICINE UNIT NO. 6						
530.20	PREVENTIVE MEDICINE UNIT	15 -	SF	11,466	845	11,466	845
	1/ INCLUDES $6,389,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT			TOTAL	4,060		4,060

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is $4,060,000 for an enlisted men's dining facility—that does sound better than a messhall—an evaluation center, and a preventive medicine unit.

ENLISTED MEN'S DINING FACILITIES

What are we now using as a dining facility?

Mr. TAYLOR. At the present time, they have a World War II facility that is remotely located from the present enlisted berthing area. This facility is old, it is termite-ridden, and it is beyond economic repair.

Mr. SIKES. What are you going to do with it?

Mr. TAYLOR. This messhall will be demolished, sir, upon the completion of the new facility.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record your past experience on the workload in this facility.

[The information follows:]

ENLISTED MEN DINING FACILITY—PEARL HARBOR

A survey conducted at the station indicates that out of a total of 2,603 men living in the area, and eligible to use the dining facility, an average of only 1,083 men are actually counted at meal time.

Mr. SIKES. You are building for greater capacity than you have had in the past. Why is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not certain what the capacity of the old one is. I will provide it and the explanation for the record.

[The information follows:]

COMPARATIVE SIZE

The building that is being replaced contains 25,702 square feet. The new building will contain only 13,952 square feet. The existing mess hall is rated as a 1,000-man mess so there is a possible confusion in comparing the number of men (1,000) with the number of square feet.

EXISTING FACILITIES ON FORD ISLAND

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record a listing of the permanent facilities on Ford Island and their present utilization. Also indicate for what use they were constructed and whether they are being fully utilized.

[The information follows:]

The existing facilities are not fully utilized.

FORD ISLAND FACILITIES

BLDG #	CURRENT USE(S)/USER	ORIGINAL USE	AREA (SF)
170	Admin Building/U.S. Army	Warehouse	6,620
171	Admin Building/U.S. Army	Warehouse	6,540
55	EM Barracks/NAVSTA BEQ Office	EM Barracks	166,447
55	Bank/Bank of Hawaii	EM Barracks	608
44	General Warehouse/NAVSTA Operations	EM Barracks	4,104
175	EM Barracks/U.S. Army	Hangar	42,315
175	Admin Office/U.S. Army	Hangar	22,048
136	EM Barracks/NAVSTA BEQ Office	EM Barracks	54,340
78	BOQ/NAVSTA BOQ Office	BOQ	58,354
89	Indoor Theatre/Special Services	Theater	14,512
89	Personnel Shelter/Disaster Control	Theater	2,500
S96	Personnel Shelter/Disaster Control	Air Raid Shelter	4,611
S99	Personnel Shelter/Disaster Control	Air Raid Shelter	8,516
S180	Personnel Shelter/Disaster Control	Air Raid Shelter	3,412
S181	Personnel Shelter/Disaster Control	Air Raid Shelter	4,258
42	Admin/NRFC	Fire Station	2,741
42	Telephone Exchange/PWC	Fire Station	1,352
42	Post Office/NAVSTA Rep	Fire Station	1,344
42	Laundry Mat/Thrifty Wash	Fire Station	432
216	BEQ/NAVSTA (Vacant)	Admin	8,370
217	Hobby Shop/Special Services	Hobby Shop	1,938
37	Gym/NAVSTA Special Services	Hangar	42,552
88	EM Club/Navy Exchange	EM Club	15,764
6	General Warehouse	Boat Storage	68,693
26	Training Building/FLETRAGRU	Warehouse	36,695
86	Applied Instruction/FLETRAGRU	Warehouse	8,750
132	Training Structure/FLETRAGRU	Ordnance Training	1,344
204	WATRFR Operations Bldg/COMTHIRDFLT	Recreation Bldg	1,950
26A	SSBN Term/Trnr/NAVSUTRACENPAC	Warehouse	46,471
39	SSBN Term Trnr/NAVSUTRACENPAC	Warehouse	201,260
87	General Warehouse/FICPAC	Warehouse	53,864
87	Admin Office/FICPAC	Warehouse	3,600
75	Admin Building	Admin Building	39,600

The primary mission of Ford Island when these buildings were constructed was a Naval Air Station. The original use for each building is no longer recorded.

S169	Photo Bldg/U.S. Army	Warehouse	8,998
S168	Photo Bldg/U.S. Army	Magazine	8,998
219	Damage Control (Vacant)	Damage Control	962
220	Damage Control (Vacant)	Damage Control	962
221	Damage Control (Vacant)	Damage Control	962
222	Damage Control (Vacant)	Damage Control	962
223	Damage Control (Vacant)	Damage Control	962
284	Shop, Engine Test (Vacant)	Test Cell	29,196
3	Ready Supply/NAVSTA Supply	Ship Repair	6,240
3	Boat Repair/NAVSTA Operations	Ship Repair	14,897
174	General Warehouse/NAVSTA (Vacant)	Warehouse	9,724
173	Smoke Drum Warehouse (Vacant)	Smoke Drum	1,996
43	General Warehouse/NAVSTA	Warehouse	19,800
94	General Warehouse/NAVSTA/Supply	Warehouse	9,518
130	General Warehouse/U.S. Army	Hangar	29,640
134	General Warehouse/NAVSTA Rep	Hangar	29,640
176	General Warehouse/U.S. Army	Hangar	64,363
207	Messhall Storage/NAVSTA Supply	Warehouse	1,995
225	General Warehouse/NAVSTA Operations	Aircraft Shop	3,472
264	General Warehouse/NAVSTA Supply	Warehouse	1,180
293	General Warehouse (Vacant)	Warehouse	515
S214	General Warehouse/NAVSTA Rep	Warehouse	10,125
79	Operational Storage/NASA	Aircraft Shop	42,875
79	General Warehouse/Marines MCAS	Aircraft Shop	42,875
79E	General Warehouse/Marines MCAS	Aircraft Shop	71,535
79W	General Warehouse/Marines MCAS	Aircraft Shop	77,285
309	Flammable Storage/U.S. Army	Flammables	240
310	Flammable Storage/U.S. Army	Flammables	240
211	Flammable Storage/U.S. Army	Flammables	240
S41	Storage (Vacant)	Warehouse	1,106
25	General Warehouse/NAVSTA Operations	Ship Repair	1,455
25	Administrative Office/NAVSTA Opns	Ship Repair	800
38	Auto Storage/NAVSUBTRACOMPAC	Aircraft Shop	119,546
54	Auto Storage/NAVSTA Rep	Hangar	76,069
133	Auto Storage/U.S. Army	Hangar	29,640
76	Dispensary/NAVRFCMED Cl	Dispensary	16,916
76	Dental Clinic/Dental Clinic	Dispensary	2,548
77	Administrative/FICPAC	Administrative	36,500
77	OPCON/Com 3rd Flt	Administrative	10,500
77	Photo Lab/COMOCEANSYSPAC	Administrative	4,000
166	Admin Building/U.S. Army	Warehouse	3,045
167	Admin Bldg/U.S. Army	Warehouse	21,959
175	EM Barracks/U.S. Army	Hangar	42,315
175	Admin Office/U.S. Army	Hangar	22,048
208	Admin Office/COMOCEANSYSPAC	Air Raid Shelter	5,074
208	Pers Shelter/Disaster Control	Air Raid Shelter	600

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

Mr. SIKES. Take up the naval submarine base at Pearl Harbor and place in the record page II–19.

[The information follows:]

NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII, $2,562,000

This base is the only mid-Pacific intermediate level logistic base for two squadrons of nuclear attack submarines. (SSN)

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will modernize existing quarters and mess for 474 men currently using a 4-year-old structure which is inadequate and lacks proper ventilation and electrical facilities.

The bachelor officers quarters project will modernize existing quarters and mess for 30 officers currently living in inadequate, grossly substandard quarters affording only 217 square feet net living area per man.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$15,165,000
Cumulative obligations, December 31, 1972 (actual)	10,820,493
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	12,291,541

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters and mess modernization	$103,844	14
Bachelor officer's quarters and mess modernization	31,217	10

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NSB, Pearl Harbor:	
1. Effective BEQ requirement	1,689
2. Adequate assets	576
Installation	539
Community	37
3. Deficit	1,113
4. Fiscal year 1974 project (mod.)	474
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	639
Current Bachelor Officer Status at NSB, Pearl Harbor:	
1. Effective BOQ requirement	97
2. Adequate assets	54
Installations	48
Community	6
3. Deficit	43
4. Fiscal year 1974 project	30
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	13

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL SUBMARINE BASE

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET	607S-700	PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1919	HONOLULU	10 MILES SOUTHEAST TO HONOLULU

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Maintain and operate facilities to support training and experimental operations of the Submarine Forces: provide logistic support to submarines, including their upkeep and repairs: within capabilities, provide logistic support to other activities in the area.

Major Activities Supported:
Commander, Submarines Forces, US Pacific Fleet
2 Attack submarine squadrons

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	397	3,159	267	0	0	41	142	0	4,006
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977	425	3,362	270	16	163	26	69	0	4,331

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	108	42	21,532	21,574
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	0	(0)	0	0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				21,574
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				6,878
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,562
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				6,655
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				37,669

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS AND MESS MODERNIZATION	41 -	SF	155,892	2,013	155,892	2,013
724.10	BACHELOR OFFICERS' QUARTERS AND MESS MODERNIZATION	71 -	SF	40,680	549	40,680	549
				TOTAL	2,562		2,562

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $2,562,000 for a bachelor enlisted quarters and mess, and a bachelor officer quarters and mess.

This must be old style; is this not the new enlisted dining facility?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We seem to be a little inconsistent in our nomenclature, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. What is the nature and condition of current berthing and messing facilities?

Mr. TAYLOR. At the present time, we only have 576 adequate enlisted spaces. We have a requirement for 1,689 spaces. We have quite a deficiency for bachelor enlisted personnel. This facility will provide for 475 men of our total deficiency. In the area of officers, we have existing only 54 adequate assets which include 6 in private housing. We have a requirement to house 97 officers, leaving us a deficit of 43 men. We have a permanent facility which is capable of being modernized. We are proposing to modernize it to satisfy 30 of this 43-man deficiency.

Mr. SIKES. Is that included in the project before us?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir. That is the BOQ and mess modernization project.

Mr. SIKES. Will there be any facilities which are no longer required as a result of either project?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Could you accommodate more bachelor officers off-base instead of providing new facilities, or modernized facilities on base?

Admiral MARSCHELL. This is a very high-cost area, Mr. Chairman. Essentially, I think the answer is, "No".

NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

Mr. SIKES. Take up the Naval Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor. Insert page II–22 in the record.

[The information follows:]

NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII, $1,985,000

The Public Works Center provides shore utilities for the operating forces of the Navy located at the Pearl Harbor Naval Complex.

The additional utilities berthing wharves project will provide electrical power to five berthing piers. This will allow the ships to go "cold iron."

The electrical distribution system project at Ford Island will improve the existing system to a capacity sufficient to meet the islands increasing power demands.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$16,890,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	13,766,357
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	14,392,449

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Additional utilities, berthing wharves	$8,000	21
Electrical distribution system improvement	5,700	22

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND	5118-650	PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1946	HONOLULU	6.5 MILES SOUTHEAST TO HONOLULU

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide public works, public utilities, public housing, engineering services, shore facilities planning support and all other public works logistics support incident thereto, required by the operating forces, dependent activities and other commands located in the vicinity of the Naval Complex served by the Public Works Center.

Major Functions:
Provide utilities, housing, transportation and engineering services

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	17	1	1,560	0	0	0	0	0	1,578
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	19	6	1,560	0	0	0	0	0	1,585

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	1,700	3,541	125,359	128,900
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS #	25* - 7#	(0* - 0#)	40* - 0#	40
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				128,940
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,291
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,438 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				11,552
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				144,221

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
812.10	ADDITIONAL UTILITIES - BERTHING WHARVES	1 -	LS	-	1,863	-	1,863
	FORD ISLAND						
812.30	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	do -	LS	-	122	-	122
				TOTAL	1,985		1,985

1/ INCLUDES $453,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $1,985,000 for additional utilities at the berthing wharves and an electrical distribution system improvement. What ships will these cold iron wharves support?

Captain WATSON. Mr. Chairman, these wharves support the destroyers berthed at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. SIKES. Are they now at Pearl Harbor?

Captain WATSON. Yes, sir. The current utilities are unsatisfactory for cold iron support of the destroyers presently homeported there.

Mr. SIKES. In view of the high cost of construction in Hawaii, could you use MUSE units in lieu of this project? Provide a cost comparison for the record.

[The information follows:]

USE OF MUSE UNITS

MUSE units could be used to replace the proposed transformer stations. However, the MILCON project would still be required to provide a conventional primary and secondary distribution system, dock outlets, primary power cables between switching stations and the air-drying equipment.

On an equal capacity basis the transformer apparatus, MUSE or permanent construction, would cost the same. However, the MUSE cost increases rapidly as the customized mounting on a portable platform is considered. Other unquantifiable MUSE disadvantages are (1) portable MUSE equipment would occupy more pier space and hamper operations, (2) since all MUSE cold iron assets are now committed, use at Pearl Harbor would mean denial of MUSE service at another location, (3) MUSE equipment by design is meant for short-term solutions to utility needs using operating funds. For permanent facility solutions at a base such as Pearl Harbor, the normal MILCON facility authorization and appropriation is required.

ELECTRICAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. SIKES. What would be the effect of deferring the electrical distribution improvements?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, the effect in delaying, would be the risk of overloads on our present cabling, causing outages on Ford Island on a frequent basis and interrupting vital operations there.

Mr. SIKES. How long has that situation existed?

Mr. MURPHY. The present cables have been in place for several years but the load on Ford Island has and will continue to increase.

Mr. SIKES. Would you provide data on the increasing workload and the projections and indicate which particular projects increase the load?

[The information follows:]

ELECTRICAL DEMANDS

Recent construction projects which increased the electrical demand on Ford Island include a sewage treatment plant—fiscal year 1968 MILCON, amended by the fiscal year 1970 MILCON program—and urgent minor construction project P–180, command and control spaces, building 77. This project provided staff offices, computer and associated ADP space in a previously unoccupied portion of the third floor for establishment of the Third Fleet Headquarters. Additionally, fiscal year 1974 MILCON project P–004, Evaluation Center will increase the electrical load on Ford Island by some 750 kVA.

The increasing electrical load on Ford Island which makes it necessary to upgrade the feeder capacity is due also to anticipated normal load growth. This normal load growth is attributable to increased usage of appliances and air-conditioning in the family housing units and additional business machines and training equipment by the Ford Island commands. The normal load growth is projected to increase at 9.6 percent per year.

Mr. SIKES. Also indicate if there are functions moving out which should reduce the load.

[The information follows:]

NEEDS REDUCTION

The fiscal year 1972 MCON program provided a new building for the Fleet Intelligence Center. The building is now under construction at Makalapa, and will be finished in calendar year 1973. Upon its completion the intelligence center will be moved from Ford Island to Makalapa. The present Fleet Intelligence Center uses only approximately 300 kva of electricity.

This reduction in electrical demand was considered when determining the requirement for increasing the feeder capacity under MCON project P–412, electrical distribution system improvement—Ford Island.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. DAVIS. When you refer to an air-drying system, what are you talking about?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. That is for the compressed air system. You are referring to the additional utilities, the berthing wharves project?

Mr. DAVIS. Right.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. That is an air-drying system for the compressed air utility used on the piers to keep the air dry so that you don't have condensation in the air lines.

NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, HONOLULU, WAHIAWA, HAWAII

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Wahiawa, Hawaii. Insert page II–25 in the record.

[The information follows:]

Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, HI., $2,324,000

This activity provides fleet broadcasts, tactical ship-to-ship and point to point communications in support of Defense Communications System in the Hawaiian area.

The satellite communication terminal project will provide facilities for the programmed Phase II Satellite Communication System. Additional space is required to house the required equipment as the Phase I system does not have the capacity, quality of flexibility required to accommodate the more advanced equipment of Phase II.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living quarters for 44 men currently living in overcrowded, substandard quarters.

The VLF antenna modifications project will correct existing design deficiencies in the system which cause the current to arc to the ground, thus drawing excessive current which could damage the transmitters and which necessitates a reduction in operating power, resulting in a lower signal strength of an unacceptable level.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$11,309,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	11,309,000
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	11,309,000

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1,1973
Satellite communications terminal	$48,000	17
Bachelor enlisted quarters	4,700	11
VLF antenna modification	--	--

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NCS, Honolulu, Wahiawa, HI

1.	**Effective BEQ requirement**	693
2.	**Adequate Assets**	393
	Installation	224
	Community	169
3.	**Deficit**	300
4.	**Fiscal Year 1974 project**	44
5.	**Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974**	256

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, HONOLULU

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND	2476-904	WAHIAWA, HAWAII

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1906	HONOLULU	27 MILES SOUTHEAST TO HONOLULU

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provides Fleet broadcasts. tactical ship-to-shore and point-to-point communications in support of the Defense Communications System for surface ships and submarines operating in the Hawaiian Area

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	99	1,648	334	0	0	0	0	0	2,081
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	89	1,278	334	0	0	0	0	0	1,701

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	2,474	132	27,930	28,062
b. LEASED AND EASEMENTS #	9* - 5#	(1* - 1 #)	268*-0#	270
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				28,332
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				272
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				2,324
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				4,056
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				34,984

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
131.35	SATELLITE COMMUNICATION TERMINAL	27 -	LS	-	1,006	-	1,006
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	52 -	SF	7,506	468	7,506	468
	NRS LUALUALEI						
132.10	VLF ANTENNA MODIFICATION	1 -	LS	-	850	-	850
			TOTAL	2,324			2,324

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $2,324,000 for a satellite communication terminal, bachelor enlisted quarters, and VLF antenna modification.

What is the necessity for the SATCOM II installation here?

Mr. TAYLOR. Sir, the phase 2 satellite is scheduled for launch this fall. We need increased capacity to accommodate the increased capacity that is available in the new satellite. In other words, the increased communication capability of the new satellite cannot be fully used until we install additional equipment to use this satellite. The terminal equipment for the entire Navy phase 2 satellite communication was funded in fiscal year 1973 for $6 million. The procurement contract for the equipment for Honolulu is scheduled in the second quarter of fiscal year 1974 with the delivery onsite of the equipment scheduled in June, July of 1975.

Mr. SIKES. What is the offbase support situation for bachelor personnel here; is it any better than at other areas in Hawaii?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. The Naval Communication Station is located at Wahiawa, about the center of the Island of Oahu. The offbase support is rather minimal in this area. We do have 169 at the present time living off base. This is about the maximum that the private community can support.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT (INSIDE UNITED STATES)

Mr. SIKES. Pollution abatement. Insert page II–88 in the record.

[The information follows:]

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1974

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Authorization	Appropriation
Pollution abatement (inside the United States):		
Various naval installations: Air pollution abatement facilities (800.00–LS)	27,636	27,636
Various naval and Marine Corps installations: Water pollution abatement facilities (800.00–LS)	60,680	60,680
Total	581,462	580,180

Mr. SIKES. Are all of the projects which you list at firm installations?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir; they are.

AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT (INSIDE UNITED STATES)

Mr. SIKES. Take up Air Pollution Abatement. Insert pages II–89 through 94 in the record.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGOR ODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9 STATE/COUNTRY
$ 27,636,000	P.L.	800.00	VARIES	VARIOUS LOCATIONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 27,636,000		-	AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION		15. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY			
a. PERMANENT	X	a. NO OF BLDGS -	b. NO OF STORIES -	c. LENGTH -	d. WIDTH -
b. SEMI-PERMANENT		e. DESIGN CAPACITY VARIES		f. GROSS AREA -	
c. TEMPORARY		g. COOLING -	CAP -	COST ($ -)	

16. TYPE OF WORK	
a. NEW FACILITY	X
b. ADDITION	
c. ALTERATION	
d. CONVERSION	
e. OTHER (Specify)	
16. REPLACEMENT	
17. TYPE OF DESIGN	
a. STANDARD DESIGN	X
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	
c. DRAWING NO. -	

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

The work shall consist of air emission controls, fuel conversion, smoke elimination, sandblast and paint facilities, pipe insulation working facilities, and other air pollution abatement facilities, as required.

Specific work at each location is as defined by engineering studies.

When local conditions permit a more advantageous accomplishment of any portion of this project by connection to or utilizing or participating in a public system, the public system will be utilized and if a capital contribution to the cost of the public system is necessary, project funds will be used for such contribution.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20 PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES			$	$
NAVAL INSTALLATIONS	LS	-	-	24,479
MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS	LS	-	-	3,157
22 TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 27,636

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M NOT APPLICABLE)		
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT		
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	( )	
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE		
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY		
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)		
	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION		
g. INCLUDED IN FY PROGRAM		
h. DEFICIENCY (e - a - f - g)		

24 RELATED PROJECTS

25. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

PROJECT: This project includes items to provide for air pollution abatement through conversion of boilers to use low sulfur fuel, construction of sandblast and paint facilities, improvements to industrial shop areas utilizing particulate emissions controls, and other construction to eliminate smoke and air pollution as required.

REQUIREMENT: This project is required to continue the Navy's program for correcting, controlling, and preventing air pollution at Naval and Marine Corps installations, and to comply with Federal, State, and local air pollution abatement standards.

CURRENT SITUATION: Facilities at Naval and Marine Corps installations were often constructed with inadequate controls to meet present day environmental quality standards. Airborne emissions are discharged directly into the air in violation of existing air quality standards.

ADDITIONAL: This project complies with current air quality standards for these items at their locations. Air pollution abatement facilities are provided at the following locations:

Continued on 1391c

DD FORM 1391 1 OCT 70

POLL ABATE AIR - TUS

861

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

25. BASIS OF REQUIREMENT (CONTINUED)

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
CALIFORNIA			
MCB Camp Pendleton	Fuel Conversion	365	The present fuel systems in the Chappo and Margarita areas cause emissions into the atmosphere in excess of air quality standards. This item extends natural gas service to the boiler plants, converts the oil-fired heating systems to natural gas with all necessary control equipment and extends steam distribution system, and thereby bring these facilities into compliance with air pollution abatement standards.
MCAS El Toro	Fuel Conversion	1,698	Existing Station boiler plants, furnaces and heating units emit pollutants into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. Much of this equipment dates back to 1943 and is undersized to meet present day building standards. This item upgrades and converts all heating systems to use natural gas as the primary fuel source. Provides a loop pipe distribution system to all structures on the Station and constructs propane fuel facilities for use as a secondary fuel source and thereby bring this Station into compliance with air pollution abatement standards.
Long Beach NSY	Sandblast and Paint Facility	4,152	Present Outdoor sandblasting and painting operations emit particulate matter into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item constructs a controlled environment facility to perform indoor sandblasting, cleaning and painting operations of shipboard equipment, steel plates and structural shapes and brings this major industrial facility in compliance with air pollution ordinances.
Mare Island NSY Vallejo	Sandblast and Paint Facility	4,894	Present outdoor sandblasting and painting operations emit particulate matter into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item constructs a controlled environment facility to perform indoor sandblasting, cleaning and painting operations of shipboard equipment, steel plates and structural shapes and brings this major industrial facility in compliance with air pollution ordinances.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
CALIFORNIA (Cont'd)			
Mare Island NSY Vallejo	Air Emission Control Facilities	1,227	The Shipyard industrial operations including lead casting, foundry working, plating and metal working emit particulates and vapors into the atmosphere in violation of air quality standards. This item provides scrubber systems, dust and particle collection/control systems and other pollution preventive systems as required to bring these industrial shop areas in compliance with applicable air pollution standards.
NAS North Island	Sandblast Facility	227	The existing sandblasting operation of all types of equipment used by Station activities is done in a semi-controlled walled enclosure or in an uncontrolled outside area with particulate matter emitted into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item constructs a sandblasting booth complete with grit collectors and filters to eliminate the air pollution due to sandblasting operations and thereby bring this industrial operation into compliance with air pollution abatement standards.
NSC Oakland	Paint Shop Facility	300	At present, paint and solvent fumes are emitted into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item constructs a paint shop with facilities to trap and retain paint particulates and fumes and bring this industrial operation in compliance with air pollution abatement standards.
PWC San Diego	Sandblast Facility	684	The existing sandblasting and painting operation of waterfront equipment including buoys, chains, anchors and floats is accomplished in an uncontrolled open area with particulate matter emitted into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item constructs a facility to house the sandblasting operation and paint booths with grit collectors and filters to eliminate the air pollution and bring this industrial operation into compliance with air pollution abatement standards.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
CALIFORNIA (Cont'd) MCAS Santa Ana	Fuel Conversion	344	Existing boilers, furnaces and heaters emit pollutants into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item extends existing on-station natural gas service to all buildings not now supplied with natural gas. Provides for the conversion of all heating systems now using oil-fired to natural gas-fired systems with a propane standby secondary fuel source and thereby bring these facilities into compliance with air pollution abatement standards.
HAWAII Pearl Harbor NSY	Pipe Insulation Working Facility	109	The work of cutting, sewing, folding and fitting asbestos and fiberglass is performed in an enclosed area with inadequate air exhaust systems to control the dust affecting the health of personnel. This item provides alterations to an existing building including proper ventilation and exhaust systems to bring this industrial operation into compliance with health and air pollution standards.
Pearl Harbor NSY	Sandblast and Paint Facility	1,193	The existing sandblasting and painting operation is accomplished in an environmentally uncontrolled open area with particulate matter emitted into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution requirements. This item constructs a controlled environment facility to perform indoor sandblasting, cleaning and painting operations of shipboard equipment, steel plates and structural shapes and bring this major industrial operation in compliance with air pollution ordinances.
NEW JERSEY NAD Earle	Fire Fighting School Smoke Abatement & Relocation	170	During simulated shipboard fire fighting training ashore, the fires at the existing fire fighting school produce large volumes of objectionable smoke, that have prompted community protest, and is in violation of air quality standards. With the grave danger of uncontrolled fire at sea, the Navy and the Merchant Marine cannot do without this vital training. The Military Sealift Command Atlantic must relocate from their present facilities at the Military Ocean Terminal, Bayonne, N.J. to NAD Earle, N.J. since the MOT Bayonne needs the area for additional cargo operational space. This item provides for construction of a new school which will be equipped with sufficient pollution abatement equipment to satisfy all air and water quality standards.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
PENNSYLVANIA			
Philadelphia NSY	Foundry Stack Emission Control	1,539	This Shipyard has been designated as the principal facility for East Coast foundry work consisting of metal melting and casting. The existing furnaces emit smoke and particulates into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item provides the air pollution control systems for the electric arc furnaces and installs two new electric induction furnaces in place of the old reverberatory furnaces to correct these deficiencies and bring the foundry into compliance with the City of Philadelphia air pollution abatement standards.
SOUTH CAROLINA			
Charleston NSY	Pipe Insulation Working Facility	351	The working with asbestos and fiberglass materials is performed in an area unacceptable for this purpose causing health problems to those persons working with this material and to those in surrounding areas as well as violating current air pollution abatement standards This item provides a specially equipped area with environmental controls to bring this industrial operation into compliance with health and air pollution standards.
VIRGINIA			
Norfolk NSY Portsmouth	Sandblast & Paint Facility	3,621	Present outdoor sandblasting and painting operations emit particulate matter into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item constructs a controlled environment facility to perform indoor sandblasting, cleaning and painting operations of shipboard equipment, steel plates and structural shapes and brings this major industrial facility in compliance with air pollution ordinances.
MCDEC Quantico	Heating Plant Stack Emission Control Facilities	750	Present boilers at the Central Heating Plant emit smoke and particulates into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item provides the air pollution control systems to the boilers and alters the existing oil burner control equipment to have capability to burn various fuels and thereby bring this Plant into compliance with the air pollution abatement standards.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION
WASHINGTON			
Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Metal Preparation Facility	3,145	During the existing operations of chemical cleaning, sandblasting, painting, plating and surface treatment of metal surfaces, particulate matter is emitted into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution abatement standards. This item constructs a central environmentally controlled facility to perform these industrial operations that conform to air pollution abatement standards.
Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Boiler Plant Emission Control Facilities	2,867	At present, the boilers at the Central Power Plant and at the West End Steam Plant emit particulate matter into the atmosphere in excess of air pollution standards. This item installs new burners and controls to enable these boilers to adequately burn low sulfur oil, replaces the existing oil storage system and replaces two archaic boilers with a new boiler. This item will bring these plants into compliance with the air pollution abatement standards.
	AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES	27,636	

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $27,600,000, for air pollution abatement facilities at 15 Navy and Marine Corps installations inside the United States. You include requests for three fuel conversion projects, one each at Camp Pendleton, El Toro, and Santa Ana. In view of the reported shortage of natural gas, are these conversions wise?

FUEL CONVERSION PROJECTS

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir. In the case of Santa Ana and El Toro, the supplier indicates that he can fill all of our requirements. In the case of Camp Pendleton, the critical time for pollution abatement is during the summer when gas is generally available. If our gas supply is interrupted, we will go to back up fuel, and will use oil.

Mr. SIKES. What are you using now?

Commander GROFF. We are using oil now, sir.

NEW SANDBLASTING FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. At Long Beach, Mare Island, North Island, Oakland, San Diego, Pearl Harbor, Earle, Charleston, Norfolk, and Puget Sound, you are actually requesting new buildings rather than the conversion of existing facilities. Why is this necessary?

Commander GROFF. The majority of the buildings requested are sandblasting facilities. Buildings for this function do not now exist. We conduct sandblasting in open areas in violation of air standards. By putting these operations within a building, we not only meet air pollution criteria but we also effect certain efficiencies in operation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

NEED FOR PROJECTS

Mr. LONG. I suppose there are always going to be borderline questions on pollution abatement items as to whether they are needed; right?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. The thing that enters my mind and probably ought to interest this committee is whether that which you are asking for is the most essential, and not just a way to get a new building.

Admiral MARSCHALL. About 90 percent of our pollution projects are to meet situations where we are in violation of the law.

Mr. LONG. Are you choosing those things which have the greatest urgency?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We hope so.

Mr. LONG. What check do you have on that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The check that we have——

Mr. LONG. You understand what is going on in my mind?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I know, certainly.

For example, with respect to their sandblasting, one of our shipyard commanders was cited in violation of the law fairly recently. That is a glaring case, and we want to take care of that as quickly as we can. We have established a program in the Navy to determine the Navy's environmental data base, and by means of determining where our pollutants are and comparing them with the local, State, and Federal regulations which exist for the particular location, we have

gone a long way toward determining specifically what our most important items are. We try to follow this. This environmental data base is not completed yet nor will it be for a couple of years, but we are using the information as we get it. It is a very, very difficult thing to decide which is most urgent this year and which is something that can be deferred.

Mr. LONG. Are the other items in your request also urgent?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think there will be items in our request for some years to come which will have increasing urgency as the years go by in order to meet the various requirements imposed by the law. We feel that the ones this year are the most critical ones for fiscal year 1974.

Mr. LONG. Have you inspected these to make sure the projects for which you are asking money are ones which will actually remedy a true pollution problem, as opposed to being a means of getting a new building, with pollution abatement as a side product?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In some cases, of course, the new building is preventive medicine. That is a byproduct of the requirement to refrain from polluting the atmosphere. We hope that we have delineated our projects well enough so the ones in the pollution area will stand on the basis of being needed to stop pollution and those we require otherwise stand on their own feet.

Mr. LONG. This is all air pollution?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This is the first phase of it, yes, sir.

PRIORITIES

Mr. LONG. Which would you put first, air pollution or water pollution?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Air pollution is first in the cycle books.

Mr. LONG. In the order in which you are asking for them?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. We have those grouped that way.

Mr. LONG. What are your priorities as between air and water pollution?

Admiral MARSCHALL. They are all priority one. They are all based on possible violations of law.

Mr. LONG. You have not decided to put air pollution ahead of water pollution?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir.

Mr. LONG. What is the situation with regard to priorities of the individual items?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The individual item must stand on its own feet. The only reason it is put this way is A coming before W. We grouped them for convenience really.

Mr. SIKES. Provide the committee with information which you otherwise would have provided on the regular 1391 form on each of these projects which have been mentioned.

(The information follows:)

Detailed cost breakouts for the Air Pollution facilities for the mentioned fuel conversion projects are as follows:

	U/M	Quantity	Unit Cost	Cost ($000)
MCB CAMP PENDLETON (CHAPPO & MARGARITA AREAS), CA				
Fuel Conversion	LS	-	$ -	$ 293
a. Gas Line	LF	12,000	9.00	108
b. Burner Conversion	EA	4	5,000	20
c. Orifice Changes	EA	50	100.00	5
d. Boiler & Appurtenances	LS	-	-	160
Supporting Facilities				72
a. Steam & Condensate Lines (UG)	LF	800	90.00	72
Total Project Cost				365
MCAS EL TORO, CA				
Fuel Conversion to Natural Gas	LS	-	-	1,698
a. Convert Existing Equipment	LS	-	-	984
b. LPG Standby System	LS	-	-	392
c. Gas Main Loop	LF	33,760	6.34	214
d. Gas Distribution System	LF	48,800	2.15	105
e. Connection Charge	LS	-	-	3
Total Project Cost				1,698
MARINE CORPS AIR STATION (HELICOPTER), SANTA ANA, CA				
Fuel Conversion	LS	-	-	344
a. Convert Existing Equipment	LS	-	-	182
b. LPG Standby System	LS	-	-	102
c. Distribution System	LF	11,650	3.00	35
d. Connection Charge	LS	-	-	25
Total Project Cost				344

Detailed cost breakouts for Air Pollution facilities which require new building construction at the above mentioned activities are as follows:

NAVAL SHIPYARD, LONG BEACH, CA				
Sandblast and Paint Facility				
Blast, Paint & Steel Yard Facility	SF	54,010	66.47	3,590
a. Abrasive Blast & Paint Building	SF	48,400	28.88	1,398
b. Cleaning Facility	SF	5,610	26.92	151
c. Built-in Equipment	LS	-	-	1,921
d. Abrasive Storage Silo	LS	-	-	120
Supporting Facilities				562
a. Special Foundations-Piling	LS	-	-	25
b. Electrical Substation	KV	750	58.67	44
c. Electrical Distribution Lines	LS	-	-	94
d. Utility Distribution Lines	LS	-	-	75
e. Paving and Site Work	SY	6,000	10.50	63
f. Security Fencing	LS	-	-	22
g. Relocate Buildings	LS	-	-	202
h. Demolition of Buildings	SF	6,800	5.44	37
Total Project Cost				4,152

AIR POLLUTION (Cont'd)

MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD, CA				
Sandblast and Paint Facility	SF	55,035	73.54	4,047
a. Central Facility	SF	54,555	40.15	2,190
b. Solvent Storage Building	SF	480	16.67	8
c. Built-in Equip(Incl Weight Handling)	LS	-	-	1,757
d. Special Process Equipment	LS	-	-	92
				847
Supporting Facilities				268
a. Special Foundations-Piling	LF	29,310	9.14	55
b. Electrical Substation	KV	1,500	36.67	36
c. Electrical Distribution Lines	LS	-	-	32
d. Mechanical Distribution Lines	LS	-	-	46
e. Railroad Spur Tracks	LF	720	63.89	44
f. Paving	LS	-	-	109
g. Relocate Fuel Tanks & Sand Silos	LS	-	-	257
h. Demolition	LS	-	-	
Total Project Cost				4,894
MARE ISLAND NAVAL SHIPYARD, CA				
Industrial Particulate				
Air Emission Control Facilities	LS	-	-	1,118
a. Mechanical Equipment	LS	-	-	762
b. Duct Work and Hoops	LB	120,550	2.64	318
c. Controls and Interlocks	LS	-	-	38
				109
Supporting Facilities				82
a. Steel Foundations and Supports	LB	27,600	2.97	3
b. Concrete Foundations	SF	780	3.85	12
c. Gas Distribution Line	LF	500	24.00	12
d. Demolition	LS	-	-	
Total Project Cost				1,227
NAVAL AIR STATION, NORTH ISLAND, CA				
Sandblast Facility	LS	-	-	178
a. Shop Building	SF	1,600	30.00	48
b. Sandblasting Booth	SF	800	162.50	130
				49
Supporting Facilities				8
a. Electrical Substation	KV	100	80.00	9
b. Electrical Distribution	LF	900	10.00	4
c. Telephone Lines	LF	300	13.33	4
d. Water Distribution Line	LF	320	12.50	9
e. Sanitary Sewer Line	LF	570	14.79	2
f. Storm Drain Manhole	EA	1	2,000	2
g. Steam Distribution Line	LF	80	25.00	1
h. Air Distribution Line	LF	140	7.14	8
i. Paving	SY	750	10.67	2
j. Landscaping	LS	-	-	
Total Project Cost				227

NAVAL SUPPLY CENTER, OAKLAND, CA				
Paint Shop Facility				
Public Works Paint Shop	SF	8,000	30.50	244
a. Building	SF	8,000	20.38	163
b. Paint Spray Booths	EA	2	36,000	72
c. Transformer	KV	200	45.00	9
Supporting Facilities				56
a. Electrical Distribution	LF	280	25.00	7
b. Telephone and Fire Alarm	LF	280	14.29	4
c. Water Distribution Line	LF	100	50.00	5
d. Sanitary Sewer Line	LF	180	16.67	3
e. Storm Drainage Line	LF	170	11.77	2
f. Gas Distribution Line	LF	190	21.05	4
g. Pavement	SY	1,000	5.00	5
h. Demolition	SF	9,766	1.13	11
i. Compressed Air System	LS	-	-	9
j. Special Foundation-Engineering Fill	LS	-	-	6
Total Project Cost				300
NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO, CA				
Sandblast Facility	LS	-	-	506
a. Sandblast and Shop Building	SF	4,100	49.02	201
b. Spray Paint Building	SF	1,056	20.83	22
c. Built-in Equipment	LS	-	-	217
d. Bridge Crane - 15 TN	EA	1	50,000	50
e. Monorail - 10 TN	EA	1	16,000	16
Supporting Facilities				178
a. Special Foundations - Piling	LF	1,800	11.67	21
b. Electric Substation	KV	530	56.60	30
c. Electrical Distribution Line	LF	140	178.57	25
d. Telephone & Fire Alarm System	LF	435	11.49	5
e. Water Distribution Line	LF	660	19.70	13
f. Sanitary Sewer Line	LF	320	25.00	8
g. Steam Distribution Line	LF	380	86.44	33
h. Compressed Air Distribution	LF	530	22.64	12
i. Paving	SY	2,904	10.67	31
Total Project Cost				684
NAVAL SHIPYARD, PEARL HARBOR, HI				
Sandblast and Paint Facility	LS	-	-	1,117
a. Building	SF	15,000	30.67	460
b. Built-in Equipment	LS	-	-	657
Supporting Facilities				76
a. Electrical Substation	KV	300	96.66	29
b. Electrical Distribution Line	LF	1,000	25.00	25
c. Telephone Line	LF	400	5.00	2
d. Steam Distribution Line	LF	200	30.00	6
e. Compressed Air System	LS	-	-	7
f. Water Distribution Line	LF	30	33.33	1
g. Sanitary Sewer Line	LF	200	30.00	6
Total Project Cost				1,193

AIR POLLUTION (Cont'd)

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, EARLE, NJ				
Fire Fighting School - Smoke Abatement & Relocation				
Relocate Fire Fighting School	LS	-	-	170
Total Project Cost				170
NAVAL SHIPYARD, CHARLESTON, SC				
Pipe Insulation Working Facility	SF	6,000	46.33	278
a. Building	SF	6,000	36.17	217
b. Dust Collection System	LS	-	-	61
Supporting Facilities				73
a. Special Foundation-Piling	LF	3,825	8.20	31
b. Electrical Distribution	LF	900	18.89	17
c. Telephone & Fire Alarm	LF	300	10.00	3
d. Water Distribution	LF	175	17.14	3
e. Sanitary Sewer	LF	25	20.00	1
f. Storm Drain	LF	25	20.00	1
g. Steam Distribution	LF	150	60.00	9
h. Paving	SY	375	10.67	4
i. Site Improvement	LS	-	-	1
j. Demolition	LS	-	-	3
Total Project Cost				351
NORFOLK NAVAL SHIPYARD, PORTSMOUTH, VA				
Sandblast and Paint Facility	LS	-	-	3,099
a. Building	SF	25,700	44.01	1,131
b. Built-in Cranes	LS	-	-	378
c. Sandblast/Paint Rooms & Equipment	LS	-	-	1,590
Supporting Facilities				522
a. Special Foundations-Piling	LF	15,680	11.42	179
b. Electrical Substation	KV	1,000	64.00	64
c. Special Equipment Foundations	LS	-	-	57
d. Telephone & Fire Alarm Lines	LS	-	-	7
e. Air, Steam & Water Distribution	LF	1,670	20.36	34
f. Sanitary & Storm Sewer Lines	LF	1,400	23.57	33
g. Paving	LS	-	-	51
h. Relocate Blast Room	LS	-	-	43
i. Relocate Railroad Track	LS	-	-	4
j. Demolition	LS	-	-	50
Total Project Cost				3,621
PUGET SOUND NAVAL SHIPYARD, BREMERTON, WA				
Metal Preparation Facility	SF	37,056	79.12	2,932
a. Building	SF	37,056	37.05	1,373
b. Special Systems	LS	-	-	583
c. Built-in Equipment	LS	-	-	976
Supporting Facilities				213
a. Relocate Existing Equipment	LS	-	-	15
b. Railroad Trackage	LF	800	58.75	47
c. Extend Utilities	LS	-	-	74
d. Paving	SY	6,055	4.46	27
e. Demolition	SF	64,000	0.78	50
Total Project Cost				3,145

STACK EMISSION CONTROL DEVICES

Mr. SIKES. What do you do when you install equipment to control smokestack emissions?

Commander GROFF. We control stack emissions by doing several things in addition to improving the efficiency of the boiler through improved control of the burning process. We can put cyclone collectors, wet scrubbers or electrostatic precipitators on stacks to reduce emissions.

Mr. SIKES. Tell us something about the cost of the equipment relating to the projects.

Commander GROFF. Can we speak to particular projects? Otherwise we would have to provide summaries for the record.

Mr. SIKES. Provide details for the record but give us something now on what it costs to install different types of equipment.

Commander GROFF. I will, with your concurrence provide this information for the record.

[The information follows:]

EQUIPMENT COSTS

There are three major types of pollution abatement equipment that are used to control stack emissions. The usage is dictated by economic considerations and general applications.

1. Dry cyclone collector: Relative cost is $1 to $1.50/CFM. Generally used on oil-fired boilers and coal-fired stoker-type boilers.
2. Wet scrubber: Relative cost is $2 to $3/CFM. Generally used on incinerators with capacities up to 50 tons/day.
3. Electrostatic precipitator: Relative cost is $3.50/CFM. Generally used on pulverized coal-fired boilers and incinerators with capacities over 50 tons/day.

Mr. SIKES. Why are there such cost variances between stack conversion at Mare Island, Philadelphia, Quantico. and Bremerton? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

COST VARIANCES

Major cost variances exist for the four air emission control facilities because the scopes of work are vastly different. The following are brief equipment summaries for each facility.

1. Mare Island, NSY.—Work includes the installation of two wet scrubbers, exhaust fans with bag filters, and breather valves in various industrial shop buildings.
2. Philadelphia, NSY.—Work includes replacement of two reverberatory furnaces with two electric induction furnaces with pollution abatement control systems including air cleaners and bag collectors.
3. MCDEC, Quantico.—Work includes the installation of one electrostatic precipitator on each of four boilers and alteration of the existing oil burner control equipment on each boiler to burn various fuels.
4. Puget Sound, NSY.—Work includes replacement of 2 obsolete boilers with a new 150,000 Bh boiler with pollution abatement controls. installation of burner controls on 28 units, installation of a water treatment facility, and installation of an oil storage system.

FUELS

Mr. LONG. Are you using gas wherever you can because gas is cleaner to burn?

Admiral MARSCHALL. That is the cleanest fuel, yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Oil next?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. What about coal? You have moved out of coal altogether?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. We have not moved out of coal altogether. It is my considered opinion there will be a trend back toward coal in the future. We have a compounded problem with respect to coal. The mines themselves are subject to a great deal of regulation because of the environment, and I think there is some question as to the economics of developing certain areas because of this environmental factor. We have in no recent case gone back to coal but we will be studying it for the future because it is our greatest single asset in this country as far as fuel is concerned.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any significant progress being made toward control of air pollution from coal?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Do you know of any specifics, Commander Groff?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir, there are some developments under way to control the emissions from coal. Most of them have not yet reached the economical state of the art, however. We are in some cases, installing electrostatic precipitators and anticipate compliance with standards through this method. It depends on the standards that govern, whether State, local, or Federal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

Mr. LONG. We may want to get something else on this from the Office of Coal Research.

Do you follow that work?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir. We have also been very interested in the Senate Interior Committee's report on coal and oil and the energy crisis in particular.

Mr. SIKES. Are there further questions?

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have any problems with availability of technology to do any of the things you propose to do here?

Admiral MARSCHALL. With respect to the projects that we are putting before you now?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Admiral MARSCHALL. These are all well within the state of the art, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. You don't have any priority for obtaining natural gas? If we get into trouble, you take your lumps as well as anybody else?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We are a customer and fall in line with other customers. It is a tough proposition, and we have had, as a result of the natural gas shortage, to provide many of our facilities just recently with fuel storage and capability to shift to oil for the coming winter.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all.

WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT (INSIDE UNITED STATES)

Mr. SIKES. Take up Water Pollution Abatement inside the United States and insert pages II–95 through 106 in the record.

[The information follows:]

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974			NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$ 60,680,000	P.L.	800.00	VARIES	VARIOUS LOCATIONS INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 60,680,000		-	WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION

a. PERMANENT	X
b. SEMI-PERMANENT	
c. TEMPORARY	

15. TYPE OF WORK

a. NEW FACILITY	X
b. ADDITION	
c. ALTERATION	
d. CONVERSION	
e. OTHER (Specify)	

16. REPLACEMENT

17. TYPE OF DESIGN

a. STANDARD DESIGN	X
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	
c. DRAWING NO.	-

18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY

a. NO. OF BLDGS - | b. NO. OF STORIES - | c. LENGTH - | d. WIDTH -

e. DESIGN CAPACITY VARIES | f. GROSS AREA -

g. COOLING - CAP. - COST ($ -)

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

The work shall consist of collection and treatment of industrial and sanitary wastewaters, improvements to sewage systems, storm-sanitary sewer separation, demilitarization facility complex, and facilities to improve oil handling capability.

When local conditions permit a more advantageous accomplishment of any portion of this project by connection to or utilizing or participating in a public system, the public system will be utilized and if a capital contribution to the cost of the public system is necessary, project funds will be used for such contribution.

Specific work at each location is as defined by engineering studies.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACS.			$	$
NAVAL INSTALLATIONS	LS	-	-	56,287
MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS	LS	-	-	4,393
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 60,680

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M NOT APPLICABLE)

a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT		
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	( )	
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE		
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY		
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)		
	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION		
g. INCLUDED IN FY ____ PROGRAM		
h. DEFICIENCY (a - e - f - g)		

24. RELATED PROJECTS

28. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

PROJECT: This project includes items to provide for water pollution abatement through the construction of collection and treatment facilities for industrial and sanitary wastes, ship wastewater collection lines on shore, oil containment structures and other preventive measures to correct oily waste discharges and potential oil spills, demilitarization facility complex, and other facilities to eliminate water pollution as required.

REQUIREMENT: This project is required to continue the Navy's program for correcting, controlling, and preventing water pollution at Naval and Marine Corps installations, and to comply with Federal, State and local water pollution abatement standards.

CURRENT SITUATION: Facilities at Naval and Marine Corps installations were often constructed with inadequate controls to meet present day environmental quality standards. Industrial wastewaters and sewage are discharged untreated or inadequately treated into adjacent waterways. At present, oil and fuel handling facilities at many activities are inadequate to safeguard harbor waters from contamination and lack the facilities to contain oily waste discharges and spills.

ADDITIONAL: This project complies with current water quality standards for these items at their locations. Water pollution abatement facilities are provided at the following locations:

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1391

CONTINUED ON 1391c

POLL ABATE WATER - IUS

875

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

25. BASIS OF REQUIREMENT (CONTINUED)

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
CALIFORNIA			
NAS Alameda	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	527	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the final phase of shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.
MCB Camp Pendleton	Sewage Treatment Improvements	542	At present, the San Onofre sewage treatment plant is inadequate in size to properly treat the sewage thereby causing pollution to the underground water supply that is downstream from the treatment plant. This situation continues to violate water pollution abatement standards. This item improves existing treatment by expanding the sewage treatment facilities to provide sufficient capacity and type of treatment to meet pollution abatement criteria.
Long Beach NSY	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	3,242	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.
Mare Island NSY	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	3,700	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
CALIFORNIA (Cont'd) NSC Oakland	Oil Treatment and Storage Facilities	578	Ships' ballast, contaminated fuel and unreclaimable fuel are currently held in an open, uncovered pond prior to removal. The possibility of oil seeping through the pond walls into San Francisco Bay exists. The oil reclamation plant does not meet present day standards since it relies on archaic filtration methods for oil removal and discharges a water effluent into San Francisco Bay that contains excessive quantities of oil. This item provides an oil-water separator, two storage tanks with connection to reclamation plant and modifications to the treatment system.
NS San Diego	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	5,945	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the final phase of shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.
NSC San Diego	Fuel Containment Structures	113	This Center stores fuel, gasoline, diesel fuel and oil in tanks on the hillside above San Diego Bay. In the event of a tank leak or pipeline break, fuel will spill down the terrain, uncontrolled, and enter the storm drain system and drain into the Bay. This item constructs fuel containment structures such as berms, ditches and pipelines with control gates to provide protective measures to prevent water pollution.
CONNECTICUT NSB New London	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	1,524	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
COMNAVDIST Washington	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	444	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.
FLORIDA			
NFD Jacksonville	Waste Oil Separator	121	At present, fuel tank seepage and water draw-off drain into bermed areas around the tanks. This mixture of oil and water presents a pollution problem as oil contaminated water discharges into the St. Johns River via storm drain ditches in violation of water pollution standards. This item provides a collection system and an oil-water separator to allow only an acceptable effluent to discharge into the river.
NFD Jacksonville	Oil Pollution Control - Fuel Wharf	3,974	Piers 2 and 3 are presently used to carry fuel lines and to service the oil tankers. These piers are old, dilapidated, unsafe for vehicular traffic and are deteriorated beyond economical repair. A collapse of any section of these piers will cause rupture of the pipeline with the resultant dumping of fuels into the St. Johns River in violation of water pollution standards. This item constructs a new fuel wharf for safe handling and servicing of the fuel tankers and thereby reduce the potential for pollution of adjacent waterways.
FWC Pensacola	Waste Water Control Facilities	228	The cooling towers on the Station discharge pollutants into the storm sewers that ultimately drain into adjacent waterways. These pollutants contain chromates and acids which are used to prevent scale and corrosion of the towers. This item will install pretreatment equipment and connections to the sanitary sewer system.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
GEORGIA			
MCSC Albany	Industrial Waste Treatment Plant	449	Inadequately treated industrial wastes discharge into the Flint River in violation of existing water pollution abatement standards. This item constructs an industrial waste treatment plant to properly treat the wastes in accordance with water pollution abatement criteria.
HAWAII			
NAS Barbers Point	Municipal Sewer Connection	6,368	Present on-base sewage treatment facilities at Barbers Point and Iroquois Point provides only primary treatment with cholorination prior to discharge by shallow outfall in violation of existing water quality standards. This item constructs collection lines, pump stations, and includes connection charge to connect the Navy's facilities into the Honouliui Regional System for proper treatment and new deepwater ocean outfall that will bring the sewage systems in compliance with water pollution requirements.
NAD Oahu	Sewage System Improvements	351	At present, buildings at the Waikele Branch of this activity discharge inadequately treated sewage into Waikele Stream which ultimately flows into West Loch, Pearl Harbor. This discharge violates water quality standards. This item provides secondary sewage treatment plant with chlorination facilities and collection lines that will bring the sewage system in compliance with water pollution requirements.
NS Pearl Harbor	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	6,389	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the first phase of shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation with a second and third phase contained in the FY 1975 and FY 1976 Programs.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
HAWAII (Cont'd)			
PWC Pearl Harbor	Sewage System Improvements	453	Sewage from 200 units of Navy family housing at Camp Stover and from the treatment plant at Fleet Operations Control Center, Pacific Fleet is discharging inadequately treated sewage into streams that are principal tributaries to West Loch, Pearl Harbor. This discharge violates water quality standards. This item provides collection lines and pumping stations necessary to connect the existing system into the Tri-Service treatment plant at Schofield Barracks for proper treatment and disposal in accordance with water quality requirements.
INDIANA			
NAD Crane	Industrial Waste Collection System	372	Acids and other industrial waste products are presently discharged onto the ground causing pollution of nearby streams in violation of water quality standards. This item corrects these deficiencies by providing an industrial waste collection system, with pretreatment, discharging into an approved industrial waste treatment plant for final disposal.
NAD Crane	TNT Waste Treatment Facility	600	Wastewater from ordnance operations at the bomblet and bomb cast loading facilities is untreated and allowed to discharge on the ground and into adjacent streams in violation of water quality standards. This item constructs a treatment system for the removal of TNT pollutants from the wastewater in accordance with water pollution abatement requirements.
MISSISSIPPI			
NAS Meridian	Water Plant Backwash Control Facilities	276	At the water treatment plant, the sand filters are backwashed daily and it is this washwater, which is extremely turbid, that discharges into adjacent waterways in violation of water pollution control standards. This item provides the necessary facilities to treat the backwash water thereby conserving water and eliminating this source of water pollution.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATION
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
NEVADA			
NAD Hawthorne	Demilitarization Facility Complex	4,955	Deep water ocean dumping has been terminated in compliance with DOD, Department of Navy and EPA policy. The quantities of unserviceable ammunition requiring disposal are growing and will continue to build up until proper demilitarization facilities are provided. This large accumulation of obsolete and sometimes unstable ammunition can create serious safety hazards. This item provides the second phase to construct a demilitarization facility complex which will serve as the major West Coast disposal facility. This facility will provide controlled disposal and will conform to environment quality standards. The first phase was authorized and funds appropriated in FY 1973 MILCON Program, a third phase is programmed in FY 1975.
NORTH CAROLINA			
MCAS Cherry Point	Sewage Treatment Improvements	1,198	A malfunction in sewage lift stations, septic tanks and other miscellaneous sources allow raw sewage or inadequately treated sewage to discharge into adjacent creeks and rivers in violation of water pollution abatement standards. This item provides high water alarm systems and emergency generators for the sewage lift stations and collection and treatment plant improvements in accordance with water pollution abatement standards.
RHODE ISLAND			
PWC Newport	Sewage System Improvements	425	At present, a large number of buildings, located within the Naval Station Newport complex discharge raw sewage and industrial waste into Narragansett Bay in violation of water pollution abatement requirements. This item connects the majority of these buildings into the existing sanitary sewers, and when the buildings are remotely located provides septic tanks to treat wastes. This item corrects deficiencies in accordance with water quality standards.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS

5. PROJECT NUMBER	6. PROJECT TITLE
-	WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
SOUTH CAROLINA			
NSC Charleston	Fuel Containment Structures	331	At present, facilities for controlling spilled oil and for handling oi oily wastes are inadequate to collect and separate the oil from water This allows a contaminated water mixture to discharge into the Cooper River in violation of water quality standards. This item constructs containment structures such as ditches, berms, etc., and ballast treat- ment facilities to allow the oil to be reclaimed and clean water re- turned in compliance with water pollution abatement requirements.
MCRD Parris Island	Sewage System Improvements	116	At present, the power plant, laundry and boiler blowdown discharge un- treated or inadequately treated effluent into surrounding tidal water in violation of water pollution abatement standards. This item pro- vides pretreatment and collection for discharge into the sanitary sewer system for proper treatment at the Station treatment plant and thereby bring these facilities into conformance with water pollution abatement criteria.
TENNESSEE			
NAS Memphis	Municipal Sewer Connection	107	The existing treatment plant cannot adequately treat the sewage, which results in wastewaters polluting adjacent waterways in violation of water quality standards. This item provides for the connection of the Station's sewage collection system into the City of Memphis municipal system for final disposal in accordance with water quality requirement
VIRGINIA			
NWL Dahlgren	Sewage Treatment Plant	221	The current capacity of the treatment plant is not adequate to treat the sewage generated at this Activity. Inadequately treated sewage i discharged into surrounding waterways in violation of water pollution abatement standards. This item expands the sewage treatment plant capacity to effectively treat the sewage and meet all applicable water quality requirements.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
VIRGINIA (Cont'd)			
FCDSTC Dam Neck	Municipal Sewer Connection	600	The existing treatment plant cannot adequately treat the sewage to meet water pollution abatement requirements. This item provides for the connection of the Station's sewage collection system into the Hampton Roads municipal system for final disposal.
NAB Little Creek	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	433	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the first phase of the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.
NARF Norfolk	Industrial Waste Collection System Improvements	268	At present, various sources of inadequately treated industrial wastes discharge into storm sewers, which outfall into adjacent rivers in violation of water quality standards. This item provides a collection system sufficient to transfer these wastes directly to the treatment plant for final disposal in accordance with water pollution abatement requirements.
NCS Norfolk	Sewage Treatment Facility	620	The sanitary sewage at the Receiving Facility is presently treated in a sewage stabilization pond which is overloaded and cannot adequately treat the sewage to meet sewage treatment criteria and is polluting the Northwest River. This item constructs a new sewage treatment facility and converts the existing pond into an emergency overflow holding basin to conform to water quality standards.
NS Norfolk	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	1,977	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. (Continued)

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
VIRGINIA (Cont'd)			
NS Norfolk (Cont'd)			Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the final phase of shore facilities for collection of these ship generate wastes at this installation.
NSC Norfolk	Ballast Storage Tank	930	The existing ballast disposal system consists of open, unlined earth pits that are inadequate to allow separation of oil and water. Accordingly, reclamation of the oil is inefficient and discharges of oil polluted water into the harbor occurs in violation of water quality standards. The existing pits are not large enough to hold the discharge from a single large tanker. This item constructs two steel tanks of sufficient capacity with all proper oil and water separators to allow treated water to enter the Hampton Roads Harbor Area and meet water quality standards.
NSC Norfolk	Waste Oil Separators	847	Uncontrolled drainage from fuel tank ditches and fuel industrial area flows into the Elizabeth River and the Hampton Roads Harbor in violation of water quality standards. This item provides waste oil separators that are essential to control oil pollution at the Craney Island Fuel Facility.
PWC Norfolk	Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Facility	325	Existing makeshift facilities do not adequately provide for the handling of drained fuel from aircraft refueler trucks and other portable fuel dispensing equipment. Spillage collects in low spots and on heavily traveled streets. The hazard that spillage of explosive fuel might be carried through storm drains exists constantly. This item provides a proper facility for servicing these vehicles while eliminating a hazard to personnel, property and pollution of adjacent harbor waters.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
VIRGINIA (Cont'd)			
Norfolk NSY Portsmouth	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	2,114	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.
Norfolk NSY Portsmouth	Industrial Waste Collection System	1,000	At present, existing storm sewers are used as combined collection lines for storm water and industrial rinsewater and discharges into the Elizabeth River during periods of high rainfall in violation of water pollution abatement requirements. This item provides a separate industrial wastewater collection system, allowing all industrial wastes to go to the industrial waste treatment plant for proper treatment in accordance with water pollution standards.
MCDEC Quantico	Sewage Treatment Improvements	2,088	The present treatment facilities at the Mainside Sewage Treatment Plant do not provide adequate treatment with subsequent overflows discharging raw sewage to the Potomac River in violation of water pollution abatement standards. This item improves the quality of the existing treatment and adds tertiary treatment facilities to enable the treatment facilities to properly treat all sewage that enters the plant in accordance with current water pollution abatement criteria.
WASHINGTON			
NTS Keyport	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	434	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
17 APR 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

STATE & INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
WASHINGTON (Cont'd)			
NSC Puget Sound	Renovate Fuel Oil Handling Facilities	204	Petroleum products are transferred at the pier using long flexible rubber hoses that are susceptible to bursting or leaking causing major pollution in harbor areas that would be in violation of water quality standards. This item provides mechanical loading arms on the piers that will transfer petroleum products from ship to shore in an expeditious manner and will reduce the possibility of oil pollution incidents and minimize the fire hazard.
Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	4,625	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clean water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes at this installation.
Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Storm and Sanitary Sewer Separation	666	At present, untreated sanitary sewage discharges into the storm sewer system that outfalls into the Bay. In addition, during heavy rainfall storm water overloads the treatment plant by way of the sanitary sewage collection system and causes inadequately treated water to be discharged into the Bay. These conditions violate water pollution abatement standards. This item separates the storm water collection system from the sanitary sewage collection system, allowing the treatment plant to properly treat all sewage in accordance with water pollution abatement requirements.
	WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES INSIDE THE UNITED STATES	60,680	

Ships Waste Water Collection Facilities

Mr. Sikes. The request is for $60.6 million for water pollution abatement facilities at 31 Navy and Marine Corps installations inside the United States. You have a number of projects which you label as collection facilities. What does that mean? Do you mean that you treat ships' waste water or collect it only?

Admiral Marschall. Collect it only, Mr. Chairman. This is the discharge from ships which will be moored at these various locations, and the material collected will be put into the regular sewerage system of the activity.

FUEL PIER CONSTRUCTION, JACKSONVILLE

Mr. Sikes. At Jacksonville you propose to build a new pier. Does this tie in with the water pollution abatement program?

Admiral Marschall. Very definitely, Mr. Chairman. As you mentioned before, in some cases we are talking about preventive measures as opposed to cleanup measures. This pier is a very definite requirement to prevent spills of the future.

Mr. Sikes. I would like to have full cost details on the proposed pier for the record.

[The information follows:]

Pier Cost

The following table delineates a detailed cost estimate for the fuel wharf at NFD Jacksonville:

Item:	*Cost (thousands)*
Concrete pier	$2,316
Fuel piping	490
Tanker loading arms	356
Dredging	287
Utilities	124
Ballast facilities	117
Barge loading arms	102
Demolition existing piers	96
Access and temporary mooring	57
Sanitary sewers	29
Total	3,974

DEMILITARIZATION COMPLEX, NAD HAWTHORNE

Mr. Sikes. At Hawthorne you are building a demilitarization facility complex for $4.9 million. This is the second phase. Tell us the cost of the third phase and the total cost of the project, including equipment.

Admiral Marschall. The second phase that you mentioned is $4,955,000. The third phase is $9,056,000, and the total cost of the three increments will be $20,014,000.

Commander Kirkpatrick. It may be necessary to split that into a fourth increment, that last phase. This does not include the equipment.

Commander Groff. That is correct.

Mr. Nicholas. You say $22 million including equipment?

Commander Kirkpatrick. $20 million excluding equipment.

Mr. Nicholas. Do you have the equipment costs there?

Commander Groff. Approximately $2 million.

[Additional information follows:]

DEMILITARIZATION FACILITY COSTS

The demilitarization facility was introduced into the fiscal year 1973 MILCON program by the Senate Armed Services Committee. A concept study was required prior to initial design and construction. The concept study was completed at the normal time that fiscal year 1974 project designs were being authorized. Therefore the fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 increments were authorized simultaneously for design and the construction contract will be awarded together in August 1974. The scheduled useable completion date for the combined projects is October 1977.

The demilitarization facility complex is currently scheduled to be accomplished in three increments. Each increment within itself will provide a complete and usable facility. The three increments are described as follows:

Increment I, fiscal year 1973 authorized and funded $6.003 million, will provide the capability for performing preparatory work including fixed round disassembly, defuzing, smokeless powder separation, and removal of components from bombs, mines, and depth charges. Capability will also be provided for steamout, dewatering, flacking, and boxing of explosives from projectiles, mines, bombs, rocket motors, and so forth.

Increment II, proposed for $4.955 million authorization and funding in the fiscal year 1974 program, will provide the capability for performing contour drilling, core drilling, sawing, and punching of high explosive loaded items; and the preparation of bulk energetic material for incineration.

Increment III, planned for fiscal year 1975 programing for $9.056 million, will provide the capability for accumulation and boxing of granular smokeless powder and smokeless powder pellets; and the decontamination of processed explosive containers via small item (popping) and large item furnaces. Additionally, capability will be provided for refining bulk explosives, chemical decontamination of munition components; washout; and additional dewatering, flacking, and for boxing of explosives from projectiles, mines, bombs, rocket motors, and so forth. This latter work may be separated and programed as a fourth increment.

The total facility will provide the capability for processing of all gun ammunition from 30 caliber bullets through 16 inch projectiles; all bombs, mines, and depth charges up to 3,000 pounds net explosive weight; many solid propellant rocket grains; all Navy cluster weapons (FAE, Rockeye, APAM); and many rocket warheads, grenades, cartidge-activated devices, demolition materials, and pyrotechnics.

Mr. SIKES. I would like an economic analysis of this project for the record.

[The information follows:]

The economic analysis has not been updated to reflect recent changes in the project. The economic analysis will be provided to the committee when finalized.

Mr. SIKES. Do you have any choice under present policy other than to build something of this nature?

Commander GROFF. Currently we do not have any choice. It is a DOD policy not to dump obsolete munitions at sea, so we must build a facility to dispose of these munitions.

Mr. SIKES. Do you expect to get protests about what you propose doing in Nevada?

Commander GROFF. The facility that we are proposing for Nevada will be environmentally clean. It will not have any discharges which will be in violation of any standards there.

Mr. SIKES. What will you do with the obsolete munitions?

Commander GROFF. They will be either reclaimed or disposed of by incineration or other means.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any administrative space in this facility?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir, there is.

Mr. SIKES. How much? What part of it does it represent? What is the cost?

Admiral MARSCHALL. $252,000, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. Why is that necessary?

Commander GROFF. This administrative space is required to control the processes that go on within the facility—administrative records of personnel and control of the munitions—that are cycled through the system.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any administrative space there now?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There will be more efficient administrative space, Mr. Chairman. There are probably spaces at——

Mr. SIKES. Is there an increase in personnel at Hawthorne?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There will be for this particular facility.

Mr. SIKES. What is the present and contemplated strength?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We will provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

NAVAL AMMUNITION DEPOT, HAWTHORNE, NEV., PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	Officer	Enlisted	Civilian	Total
As of June 30, 1973	26	200	1,266	1,492
Planned (end fiscal year 1977)	26	196	1,325	1,547

Mr. SIKES. Give us a breakdown, for the record, showing what the money will be used for in addition to administrative space.

[The information follows:]

SECOND INCREMENT COST BREAKDOWN

A breakdown of the cost estimate for the second increment of the demilitarization facility complex at NAD Hawthorne showing the costs for the administration building and other facilities is as follows:

Primary facility	U/M	Quantity	Unit cost	Cost (thousands)
Demilitarization facility	SF	34,430	$104.15	$3,586
(a) Medium caliber projectile building	SF	16,430	111.52	1,832
(b) Administration building	SF	5,650	44.60	252
(c) Service buildings	SF	12,350	76.60	946
(d) Built-in equipment—boiler	LS			556
Supporting facilities				1,369
(a) Electrical distribution lines	LF	3,800	21.80	83
(b) Telephone and fire alarm lines	LF	4,400	12.73	56
(c) Water distribution lines	LF	18,900	33.07	625
(d) Steam distribution lines	LF	2,500	168.30	421
(e) Air distribution lines	LF	1,200	23.33	28
(f) Pollution abatement	LF			156
Total project cost				4,950

VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY—PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. SIKES. At Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, you seek to build a vehicle maintenance facility. Normally this would have been requested with supporting data on the regular 1391 forms. Why was this not done according to the regular procedure?

Commander GROFF. The existing facility is in violation of the water pollution standards of Virginia. This occurs because most work is performed in outdoor parking areas and some of it in temporary lean-to structures. These facilities do not provide the required collection devices for handling drained fuels and hence they drain into natural surface waters in violation of the Virginia standard.

Mr. SIKES. Provide details on this project for the record.

[The information follows:]

The existing makeshift facilities do not provide for handling drained fuels and do not possess required safety features. The majority of the work is performed in outdoor parking areas with the remaining being accomplished in temporary lean-to structures. Spillage from purging operations collect in low spots of the surrounding areas and on adjacent heavily traveled streets. Heavy fuel spillage and other pollutants are carried to other areas of the base through storm drains and discharge into Hampton Roads, a large body of water used for recreation, navigation, and fishing. These discharges are in violation of water pollution abatement standards.

This project constructs a refueling vehicle maintenance facility for the repair and maintenance of aircraft refueler trucks and other fuel dispensing equipment. This project is required by the Navy since refueler equipment is an explosive hazard and criteria prohibits servicing such equipment in automotive vehicle shops. This project will provide a facility with proper waste handling devices so that vehicles may be maintained in an environmentally acceptable manner.

SHIPS POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of the program to install holding tanks in ships?

Commander GROFF. In fiscal year 1973, the installation of collection, holding and transfer systems was initiated on 25 ships and submarines during regular overhaul. The program is to provide holding tanks and associated compoments for about 85 ships per year.

Mr. SIKES. What is the average cost per ship? I know that is difficult to determine because of the great difference in ships, but normally what amount of money are you talking about when you consider a holding tank for a ship? Take a destroyer as an example.

Commander GROFF. I would have to provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

The average cost for a holding tank on a destroyer is $700,000.

The cost of ship alterations required to reduce pollution vary greatly depending upon the type of vessel undergoing alteration. Costs for alterations to provide collection holding and transfer systems for ship's sanitary wastes vary from approximately $4.3 million for a nuclear carrier to $300,000 for a destroyer escort.

Mr. SIKES. What is the Navy's long-range program to eliminate ship waste pollution?

Commander GROFF. We have a study currently underway which will provide an ultimate system to transfer all ship wastes to shore; oily wastes, industrial wastes, and sanitary and galley wastes.

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of the program?

Commander GROFF. The program is under conceptual design now.

Mr. SIKES. That tells me nothing. Provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, charges the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with providing Federal standards of performance for marine sanitation devices (MSD's) for ships and boats. The EPA standard's main thrust is to prohibit the overboard discharge of sewage (treated or

untreated) into the navigable waters of the United States. Navy must comply within 2 years for new construction ships and within 5 years for existing ships from the date of the implementing regulations. Also, in compliance with Presidential commitment, Navy has set as a major goal the complete halt of all discharges of oil and oily waste into streams, harbors, and oceans by naval shore activities and vessels by 1975, if possible, and no later than the end of the decade.

The Navy is currently testing and evaluating various marine sanitation devices (MSD's), but none have yet been approved for service use. With the lack of an approved MSD to comply with restrictions prohibiting any discharge of sewage from ships within navigable waters, the Navy has decided to install collection, holding, and transfer systems (CHT's) on nearly all large ships and to pump ships' liquid wastes (sewage and nonoily domestic wastes) to pier sewers or barges for treatment ashore. Moreover, with regard to the cost benefits of CHT's versus MSD's, studies have shown that it is more cost effective to discharge sewage ashore for treatment rather than to treat the sewage aboard ship. For small ships and craft operating in coastal waters for extended periods of time, the installation of CHT is not always feasible because of the space and weight required for holding tanks. Zero-discharge type MSD's are under development by the Navy for installation on these smaller ships and craft to permit unrestricted operation in compliance with the laws. It is expected that these MSD's will either incinerate the waste material or concentrate the waste so that ships can hold for as much as 30 days prior to discharge to either pier sewers or the open sea.

Pier sewers are programed to be installed at naval bases to receive sewage from the CHT systems of ships or from "transporter craft" used to offload wastes from anchored ships. Construction of the pier sewers has started to meet the increasing numbers of CHT-equipped ships. The "transporter craft" mentioned is currently under study in a Navy program to develop an optimum ships waste offload system (SWOLS). Upon completion of the CHT conversion program and the pier sewer construction program, the majority of overboard discharges of sewage will be eliminated.

Projects are also underway to install shipboard systems and equipments that will minimize the chances of unintentional oilspills. These projects include ship alterations to install reliable tank level indicators and alarm systems in fuel tanks and the rerouting of fuel oil tank overflow lines to special tanks to preclude overboard losses.

Several projects are underway to enable ships to offload oily bilge wastes. These projects include ship alterations to install bilge pumps and bilge piping risers to the ship's weather deck, reduction of water drainage into the bilge, oily waste holding tanks, and the development of shipboard oil water separators and oil content monitors. A major potential for solution to the problem of discharging oily wastes into the water is the development of reliable and easily maintained oil water separators. The Navy is expediting this effort by testing and evaluating commercial state-of-the-art separators, testing of commercial units which have been modified to Navy requirements, and initiating a major research and development project to develop new concept separators for shipboard use.

In fiscal year 1973 and outyears, every ship will receive oil pollution shipalts under the fleet modernization program. These alts will enable ships in port to offload oily waste to ODR's, barges, or pier reception facilities. It is expected that procurement and installation of oil water separators can being in fiscal year 1975.

The long-range solution to oily waste collection and disposition depends greatly on the SWOLS study mentioned above. The resulting system should be capable of offloading all ships wastes from ships either berthed or nested at a pier or at anchor.

In summary, the long-range facilities plans for disposal of ship sewage are geared to meet requirements of applicable laws. In the case of ship sewage, the plan is to provide onboard most ships CHT equipment and the necessary shoreside pier facilities by approximately 1978.

Admiral MARSCHALL. If you look at the total number of ships in the Navy, which are roughly 600, we are talking about 25 that have already started installing holding tanks and initiating 80 more this fiscal year. You can see that it is just the very beginning.

Mr. SIKES. What is the policy on and status of providing sewage lines at each pier?

Commander GROFF. Pier sewers are scheduled for all the naval piers. We have approximately $35 million in pier sewers scheduled for this year.

Mr. SIKES. What is the average cost per pier?

Commander GROFF. It depends on the siting conditions. Our costs are running between $90 and $110 per lineal foot.

Mr. SIKES. What is the average cost per pier?

Commander GROFF. We would have to provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

AVERAGE COST PER PIER

The average cost to provide ship waste water collection lines on a pier is $350,000.

Mr. SIKES. What is the total cost of the program?

Commander GROFF. The total cost of the program for this year, sir, is $35 million.

Mr. SIKES. What is the total cost?

Commander GROFF. I would have to provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

PROGRAM COST

The total cost of military construction to provide sanitary sewage collection lines on the piers at all naval installations is currently estimated to be approximately $105 million.

Mr. SIKES. What alternatives were considered before the decision was made to use shipboard holding tanks and sewage lines at piers?

Commander GROFF. The Navy tested several marine sanitation devices and found them not to be reliable or readily maintainable. Accordingly, the Navy tested the collection-holding transfer system whereby ships' wastes are collected and transferred by pier sewers to shore for treatment. This proved cost effective, by a factor of approximately 4 to 1 over marine sanitation devices. These were actually tested on ships in the New England area.

Mr. SIKES. Do the conditions in New England hold true elsewhere?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Are the pier sewage lines coordinated with new ship construction and alterations so that the ships and piers have the same systems at the same time?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir, they are. Occasionally our programing of pier sewers may lead shipboard installations in order to be cost effective for a section of piers at a particular activity. In other words, it is more economical to sewer several piers rather than just one particular pier to serve a particular ship.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You are not getting ahead very fast with your installation of sewage devices on ships. You wouldn't program these facilities at three piers when you only had two piers full of ships that had holding tanks, would you?

Commander GROFF. No. We may take advantage of a larger utility systems cost advantage.

Mr. NICHOLS. Would that be the only instance where you would do that?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Other questions?

[No response.]

POLLUTION ABATEMENT (OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES)

Mr. SIKES. Take up pollution abatement (outside the United States). Insert pages II–179 through 181 in the record.

[The information follows:]

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1974

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Authorization	Appropriation
Pollution abatement (outside the United States):		
Various naval installations: Water pollution abatement facilities (800.00-LS)	3,995	3,995
Total, outside the United States	48,664	47,420

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	1974	NAVY	NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

5. PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION	6. PRIOR AUTHORIZATION	7. CATEGORY CODE NUMBER	8. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	9. STATE/COUNTRY
$ 3,995,000	P.L.	800.00	VARIES	VARIOUS LOCATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

10. PROPOSED APPROPRIATION	11. BUDGET ACCOUNT NUMBER	12. PROJECT NUMBER	13. PROJECT TITLE
$ 3,995,000		-	WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES

SECTION A - DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

14. TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION	
a. PERMANENT	X
b. SEMI-PERMANENT	
c. TEMPORARY	
15. TYPE OF WORK	
a. NEW FACILITY	X
b. ADDITION	
c. ALTERATION	
d. CONVERSION	
e. OTHER (Specify)	
16. REPLACEMENT	
17. TYPE OF DESIGN	
a. STANDARD DESIGN	X
b. SPECIAL DESIGN	
c. DRAWING NO.	-

18. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PRIMARY FACILITY

a. NO OF BLDGS - | b. NO OF STORIES - | c. LENGTH - | d. WIDTH -

e. DESIGN CAPACITY VARIES | f. GROSS AREA -

g. COOLING - | CAP - | COST ($ -)

19. DESCRIPTION OF WORK TO BE DONE

The work shall consist of collection and treatment of industrial and sanitary wastewaters.

Specific work at each location is as defined by engineering studies.

When local conditions permit a more advantageous accomplishment of any portion of this project by connection to or utilizing or participating in a public system, the public system will be utilized and if a capital contribution to the cost of the public system is necessary, project funds will be used for such contribution.

SECTION B - COST ESTIMATES

20. PRIMARY FACILITY	U/M	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	COST ($000)
WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES	LS	-	$ -	$ 3,995
22. TOTAL PROJECT COST				$ 3,995

SECTION C - BASIS OF REQUIREMENT

23. QUANTITATIVE DATA (U/M NOT APPLICABLE)		
a. TOTAL REQUIREMENT		
b. EXISTING SUBSTANDARD	(.)	
c. EXISTING ADEQUATE		
d. FUNDED, NOT IN INVENTORY		
e. ADEQUATE ASSETS (c + d)		
	AUTHORIZED	FUNDED
f. UNFUNDED PRIOR AUTHORIZATION		
g. INCLUDED IN FY ____ PROGRAM		
h. DEFICIENCY (e - e - f - g)		

24. RELATED PROJECTS

28. REQUIREMENT FOR PROJECT

PROJECT: This project includes items to provide for water pollution abatement through the construction of collection and treatment facilities for industrial and sanitary wastes and ship wastewater collection lines on shore.

REQUIREMENT: This project is required to continue the Navy's program for correcting, controlling, and preventing water pollution at Naval installations, and to comply with Federal, State, and local water pollution abatement control standards.

CURRENT SITUATION: Facilities at Naval installations were often constructed with inadequate controls to meet present day environmental quality standards. Industrial wastewaters and sewage are discharged untreated or inadequately treated into adjacent waterways.

ADDITIONAL: This project complies with current water quality standards for these items at their locations. Water pollution abatement facilities are provided at the following locations:

CONTINUED ON 1391c

DD FORM 1391 1 OCT 70

894

POLL ABATE - OUS

1. DATE	2. FISCAL YEAR	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT DATA (Continued)	3. DEPARTMENT	4. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	1974		NAVY	NAVAL INSTALLATIONS
5. PROJECT NUMBER		6. PROJECT TITLE		
-		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES		

25. BASIS OF REQUIREMENT (CONTINUED)

AREA	INSTALLATION	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	COST ($000)	REQUIREMENT & DESCRIPTION OF WORK
PACIFIC OCEAN	PWC Guam	Ship Wastewater Collection Ashore	2,783	At present, ships discharge raw or inadequately treated sanitary sewage directly into coastal waters. To achieve the goal for clear water in harbor areas, this shipboard waste must be handled in compliance with standards of performance for sewage discharges from vessels. Ships are now being modified to hold wastes for shore disposal while traversing navigable waters and when moored. This item provides the shore facilities for collection of these ship generated wastes from all berths.
	PWC Guam	Water Plant Backwash Control Facilities	454	At present, the Fena water treatment plant is the primary source of water for all Navy activities on Guam. The sand filters are backwashed daily and it's this wash water, which is extremely turbid, that discharges into a stream which flows through the villages of Agat and Santa Rita. This practice violates the water pollution control standards. This item provides the necessary facilities to treat backwash water thereby conserving water and eliminating this source of water pollution.
PUERTO RICO	NS Roosevelt Roads	Sewage Treatment Plant Expansion	758	The sewage treatment plant is currently operating at capacity and will be unable to properly treat the sewage from 250 units of family housing currently under construction. This additional load will place the treatment plant in violation of water pollution abatement standards. This item provides the necessary sewage treatment plant expansion for proper treatment and disposal to meet all applicable water pollution criteria.
		WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES	3,995	

Mr. SIKES. The total is $47,420,000. Discuss the requirement for ship waste water collection at Guam.

Commander GROFF. Ship waste water collected at Guam is programed to pump to a Navy treatment plant. The EPA standard essentially provides for no discharge from ships while they are within navigable waters. This ship waste water collection project at Guam provides a facility to receive sanitary waste waters from such ships as are able to collect them in tanks when transiting to the port in Guam and while berthed in Guam.

Mr. SIKES. Will the destroyers homeported there have holding tanks?

Commander GROFF. They are programed to receive the collection holding and transfer system.

Mr. SIKES. What are the water pollution standards? Will the projects you are requesting complete the requirements for Guam?

Commander GROFF. For ship waste water collection these projects essentially will complete the requirement at Guam; yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Will the project at Roosevelt Roads complete the requirements there?

Commander GROFF. No, sir; there are follow-on projects at Roosevelt Roads.

Mr. SIKES. For how much?

Commander GROFF. I will have to provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Additional pollution abatement projects at NS Roosevelt Roads are ship waste water collection ashore, estimated at $1.2 million and oil reclamation facilities, estimated at $300,000.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could you provide for the record the schedule of the installation of holding tanks for the ships which are to be homeported at Guam?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir; we would be most happy to. Remember that we must start now in order to have the facilities to receive waste from ships as they arrive there with waste collection holding and transfer systems installed.

[The information follows:]

The following table shows the schedule of ships which are homeported at Guam and fiscal year of installing holding tanks:

Fiscal year for installation of holding tanks	Number of ships	Ship class and hull numbers
1974	1	ARS 24.
1975	None	
1976	6	MSO 445, MSO 446, MSO 456, PG 84, PG 88, PG 89.
1977	5	AS 19, MSO 483, MSO 449, PG 85, PG 90.
1978	2	PG 92, PG 93.

In addition, submarine tenders and Polaris submarines, homeported at Pearl Harbor, operate out of Guam and will use the sanitary sewage collection lines on the piers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SIKES. Yes.

DISPOSITION OF SHIPS' WASTE

Mr. LONG. Commander, what do these destroyers and ships do with the material in their holding tanks? How do they get rid of it?

Commander GROFF. They pump it ashore when they come in to berth.

Mr. LONG. They pump it ashore?

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. They don't dump it on the high seas?

Commander GROFF. They do, but once they come within the territorial waters they hold it. They close valves and start to collect it from that point on. While they are in berth they collect it in their tanks and then pump it ashore.

Mr. LONG. Do all places where they pump it ashore have adequate facilities to take care of it?

Commander GROFF. Not at this point in time, no, sir.

Mr. LONG. Is putting it ashore sometimes just transferring the pollution problem ashore?

Commander GROFF. I am sorry, I misunderstood you. I thought you were referring to the pier sewers. There are still many places that must provide some type of collection device to transfer the waste from the ship to the shore, but by and large we have the facilities ashore to accept the waste and treat it.

Mr. LONG. What do they do with it?

Commander GROFF. They will treat the wastes in a sewage treatment plant. If we are tied into a municipal system, the municipal system accepts these wastes, treats them, and discharges a treated effluent to whatever discharge point they have.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Wastes are all sent to existing sewage treatment facilities. Ship's effluent is sent to existing sewage treatment facilities.

Mr. LONG. And this may be either good or bad?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Well, generally speaking the systems to which we pump can handle this particular effluent.

COORDINATION WITH LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Mr. SIKES. I would assume there is coordination with the local authorities in order to be sure they can handle that?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. I have gotten to be an expert on sewage because I have the Black River sewage disposal plant in my district, and it is not large enough to handle Baltimore. At certain times it can't handle it at all and explodes. If sewage is dumped everywhere it comes out through ground water, down the gutters, out through local streams, simply everywhere. It empties into creeks that look like Dante's Inferno. I suppose that is not your problem.

Admiral MARSCHALL. It is our problem.

Mr. LONG. Only where the Navy has a large impact. It is our problem for the city of Baltimore, which ought to have a better sewage disposal system. But where the Navy gets to be big enough that it overwhelms these local sewage systems, then it is a naval problem.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. Whenever we decide how to handle the particular waste we evaluate what the community assets are and——

Mr. LONG. They are usually pretty poor?

Admiral MARSCHALL. In many cases quite good.

Mr. LONG. Not many.

Admiral MARSCHALL. In those cases where we do not have the capacity in a local sewage treatment plant we must treat our own.

DUMPING WASTE AT SEA

Mr. LONG. What about the question of dumping on the high seas; do you do much?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There is nothing wrong with that at all. That is not covered by any laws, or treaty.

Mr. LONG. All the forces of virtue are getting very much excited about dumping there.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Isn't that a question of oil and industrial waste?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Fill in the details for the record on all of this discussion, and particularly differentiate between types of waste.

[The information follows:]

Navy ship's wastes can be generally classified into the following categories:

A. Hotel wastes, which include sanitary wastes or body wastes and liquid wastes from showers and galleys;

B. Oily wastes which result from fuel transfer operations (ballasting-deballasting) and contamination of bilge wastes with oil; and

C. Solid wastes, generally consisting of trash and garbage.

The EPA standards published pursuant to the 1972 amendments to the amendments to the Water Quality Act essentially prohibit the overboard discharge of ship sewage, either treated or untreated, into the navigable waters of the United States. In response the Navy is currently testing and evaluating various marine sanitation devices (MSD's) but none have yet been approved for service use. With the lack of approved, reliable, maintainable marine sanitation devices to comply with the restrictions concerning the discharge of sewage from ships, the Navy decided to install the cost-effective collection, holding, transfer system (CHT) on nearly all large ships and to pump ship's liquid wastes, that is, sewage and nonoily domestic wastes, to pier sewers or barges for ultimate treatment on shore. Ships equipped with this system will, therefore, hold their wastes while traversing navigable waters and discharge them upon reaching berth.

Oily discharges from ships which result in a visible sheen are prohibited by law within the 12 mile zone, and those discharges above 100 parts per million are prohibited between the 12 and 50 mile zones. In addition, in accordance with the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, it is unlawful for ships to discharge oil or oily mixtures certain prohibited zones which may extend more than 50 miles from the nearest land. Navy response to these restrictions includes ship alterations to install systems and equipments to minimize the potential for oil spills and to transfer oily wastes ashore for treatment where appropriate. The major potential solution to eliminate discharge of oily waste into the water is the development of reliable and easily maintained shipboard oil/water separators. The Navy is expediting this effort by first testing and evaluating commercial state of the art oil/water separators, then testing of commercial units modified to Navy requirements, and initiating major research and development projects to develop new concept separators for shipboard use.

Discharge of garbage is prohibited within 12 miles of shore and trash and rubbish within 50 miles. Further, garbage and solid wastes which are generated while a Naval vessel is in port must be disposed of while in port and not carried to set for disposal. To improve management and to comply with air pollution requirements the Navy is planning to install compactors aboard ships to properly handle and reduce refuse volumes prior to shore transfer and disposal and modifying existing shipboard incinerators as well as developing improved incinerators for those ships which do not now have them aboard.

Mr. LONG. People are getting very much excited about this problem of gumming up the ocean.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We are talking only about dumping the human and galley wastes on the high seas not bilge waste.

Commander GROFF. We cannot dump only bilge waste except in extreme cases. (Additional information was added as follows: within 12 miles of the shore.)

Mr. LONG. What is an extreme case?

Admiral MARSCHALL. As in every other case, the commanding officer of the ship, Dr. Long, decides. I think that in most cases we are able to contain these bilge wastes until we get to port.

Mr. LONG. You mean oil?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Oil is what we are concerned about primarily.

Mr. SIKES. Not everyone is concerned, but they should be.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, I was in Japan in January and found much to my surprise that they are equally aroused and equally busy taking care of the environment there. Just one example. The whole populace seems to be up in arms about the ecology there. That is one example only. Mr. Chairman, you asked for some representative figures, and Captain Ginn was able to provide me with some respect to the holding tanks aboard ship. During a normal overhaul of a DLG, which is the time when we put in holding tanks, for that, the cost of the holding tank is about $800,000. For a CVA, $3.5 million. These figures speak only to collection of the human and galley wastes.

Mr. SIKES. Are there further questions?

STANDARDS FOR NAVY AND PRIVATE SHIPS

Mr. DAVIS. Is the Navy being held to any different standards than the ordinary merchant vessel using our harbors?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir. As a matter of fact, I read recently of ships being cited in harbors.

Commander GROFF. Yes, sir, up in the Puget Sound area foreign ships have been fined for violation of standards of the area.

Mr. LONG. Naval vessels?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir, commercial vessels.

Mr. LONG. I think the gentleman raises a very interesting question. Is the Navy held to the same standards to which we hold merchant vessels?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, we hope to——

Mr. LONG. Who holds them up? I think there would be a great timidity on the part of a lot of local anthorities to do that. They don't even enforce it against others.

Admiral MARSCHALL. To tell the truth, Dr. Long, it has always been my experience that they are very, very willing to jump on the Navy first and let the others follow. We have experienced this in many, many cases. David is always after Goliath.

Mr. SIKES. What about common use of dockside facilities for waste water by Navy and commercial ships?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I didn't get the first part of the question.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any interchange or common use of dockside projects between the Navy and commercial ships for disposal of shipboard waste?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Probably not, Mr. Chairman, because generally speaking our experience has been at naval facilities where commercial vessels don't normally come.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. That is all.

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. SIKES. We will take up the 10th Naval District. Insert page II–108.

[The information follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization Project Amount	Authorization Installation Total	Appropriation Project Amount	Appropriation Installation Total
TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT				
Puerto Rico				
Naval Complex, Puerto Rico				
Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads (LANTFLT)				
P-843 Enlisted Men's Dining Facility (723.10-13,696 SF)	1,442		1,442	
Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca (COMNAVSECGRU)				
P-033 Enlisted Men's Dining Facility Improvements (723.10-6,544 SF)	265		265	
P-103 Land Acquisition (921.30-1,700 Acres)	1,244		-	
		2,951		1,707
West Indies				
Naval Facility, Grand Turk (LANTFLT)				
P-004 Electric Power and Water Plant (811.10-LS)	1,145		1,145	
		1,145		1,145
TOTAL - TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT		4,096		2,852

Mr. SIKES. The total request is for $2,852,000.

NAVAL COMPLEX, PUERTO RICO

Mr. SIKES. Take up the Naval complex in Puerto Rico.
Insert page 11–109 in the record.
[The information follows:]

Naval complex, Puerto Rico, $1,707,000.

Naval station Roosevelt Roads.

This station supports ships and aircraft of the Atlantic Fleet conducting air, surface, underwater, and amphibious training operations on the Atlantic Fleet weapons range.

The enlisted men's dining facility project will provide a new messing facility and replace an obsolete, World War II, deteriorated messhall.

Naval Security Group Activity, Sabana Seca.

This activity provides fleet broadcasts, tactical ships-to-shore and point-to point communications for the Navy and Defense Department communications system.

The enlisted men's dining facility improvements project will replace the existing 30-year-old, overcrowded, deteriorated and obsolete facility.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$65, 055, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	61, 385, 325
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	64, 352, 247

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Enlisted men's dining facility	$48, 102	32
Enlisted men's dining facility improvements	12, 000	4

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMPLEX

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	VARIOUS	PUERTO RICO

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1943	-	-

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

NAVSTA ROOSEVELT ROADS: Serve as nucleus of Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range. Support air, surface, undersea and amphibious training operations conducted by Atlantic Fleet units.
COMSTA PONCE: Operate and maintain tactical and Defense Communications System point-to-point communications.
NAVSECGRU SABANA SECA: Provide secure communications.
NAVFAC RAMEY: Classified oceanographic research.
OTHER ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED:
Commander Caribbean Sea Frontier
Naval Hospital
Commander Antilles Defense Command
Commander South Atlantic

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 1972	368	3,802	2,104	0	0	100	216	0	6,590
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	402	3,408	2,117	0	0	116	430	0	6,473

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	61,066	26,279	189,015	215,294
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS #	269*-141#	(14* - 23#)	15,697* - 37#	15,757
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				231,051
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $8,030,000)		13,964 1/
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)		3,709 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)		23,281
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				272,005

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
	NAVAL STATION, ROOSEVELT ROADS						
723.10	ENLISTED MEN'S DINING FACILITY	40 -	SF	13,696	1,442	13,696	1,442
	NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, SABANA SECA						
723.10	ENLISTED MEN'S DINING FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS	51 -	SF	6,544	265	6,544	265
921.30	LAND ACQUISITION	56 -	AC	1,700	1,244	-	-
				TOTAL	2,951		1,707

1/ INCLUDES $758,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $1,707,000 for two enlisted dining facilities.

CULEBRA ALTERNATE RANGES

Tell us about the Navy's plans with regard to Culebra for the development and use of alternate range facilities.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, the Navy is currently studying the Culebra proposition and the move attendant thereto.

Mr. SIKES. You have been doing that a long time.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. We have been told now to get out and the alternatives have been laid out before us. These alternatives are now under discussion.

Mr. SIKES. How much time do you have to talk before you have to act?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr Chairman, the Secretary of Defense on the 24th of May directed the Navy to prepare their plans to get off Culebra by July 1975.

Mr. SIKES. Where is Culebra on your map?

Mr. MURPHY. Culebra comprises a portion of our inner range. The dark blue areas indicate the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range areas. The inner range, made up of the Vieques and Culebra, is this blue area here. Culebra is here. The proposed relocation that the Secretary of Defense has told the Navy to study and prepare for, are in the islands of Monito and Desecheo off the west coast of Puerto Rico.

Mr. SIKES. Is there anyone there?

Mr. MURPHY. Neither island is inhabited. This chart indicates the extent of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range. These extend for hundreds of miles toward Trinidad, and this extends 600 miles east. Roosevelt Roads is a logistics and support complex for operations on all of these areas, Culebra being a relatively important but small part of the inner range. Roosevelt Roads will now have the logistics task of supporting our operations from the two islands off the west coast.

Mr. SIKES. When do you expect to have to make the move?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The study is now on the desk of the Secretary of the Navy for his approval.

Mr. SIKES. Is it your recommendation that the islands be utilized?

Admiral MARSCHALL. They were part of overall study we conducted and which indicated a feasibility.

Mr. SIKES. Are there any other acceptable solutions?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There were, Mr. Chairman. To my recollection these two were the ones that were most feasible.

COST OF RELOCATION OF CULEBRA RANGE

Mr. SIKES. What will be the cost of the move? I assume a new site will not be as satisfactory as Culebra, is that right?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I personally don't think so, because we have a range in being at Culebra. From the time it began until the present day, no one has been killed or injured as a result of our bombardment there. The move is going to be an expensive proposition.

Mr. SIKES. Roughly, how much will it cost?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have a figure somewhere between $15 million and $18 million for the move, depending on the speed at which we get out of Culebra and onto these other islands.

PRESSURE FOR MOVE

Mr. SIKES. What is the reason for getting out of Culebra, to make room for real estate development?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, I guess it is growing urban creep. Real estate certainly is a factor. There has been mixed reaction down there as far as I can see with respect to the Culebrans themselves. I visited that island and it is a lovely spot. The section of the island that we use is rather arid and not particularly attractive as compared with the other sections.

Mr. SIKES. What is the complaint, if nobody has been hurt?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There has been quite a bit of complaint from various elements in Puerto Rico.

Mr. SIKES. But not on Culebra.

Admiral MARSCHALL. They have expressed themselves on Culebra. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the people who made the complaints were representing the true thoughts of the Culebrans, but this is a very difficult question for me to answer.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, it always seems that you can smell out a real estate deal in something like this. Do we own this land?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We own the range; yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. We own the land?

Mr. SIKES. The land on the island?

Mr. MARKON. Yes, sir, all the land utilized by the Navy is owned by the United States.

Mr. SIKES. How many acres?

Mr. MARKON. There is approximately 800 acres on the peninsula that we use for bombardment. There is additional acreage that we use for observation and logistics support.

Mr. SIKES. What is the total acreage?

Mr. MARKON. I don't know. I will provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

CULEBRA ACREAGE

The total acreage held by the Navy on the island of Culebra is 1,619 acres. This is the acreage of the impact area (including Luis Pena Cay), the observation or operations area, and the Navy camp, or logistics support area.

Mr. SIKES. Can the land that you use for bombardment be made safe for real estate development?

Mr. MARKON. No, sir. That is highly contaminated. I doubt that it can be made safe at a reasonable cost.

Mr. LONG. In that case, what is the motive?

Mr. MARKON. That is very difficult to explain.

Mr. LONG. The real estate developers cannot develop the land while all this noise is going on, is that about it?

Mr. MARKON. It is the noise factor plus the apprehension that a shell that may go astray and may land in this area.

Mr. LONG. Does that ever happen?

Mr. MARKON. No, sir, it has never happened. It happened one time, I think, during World War II, but the accident did not affect the civilian community. It damaged the observation post.

Mr. LONG. I think this is important, Mr. Chairman, because we are going to have this problem everywhere in the United States.

We have a problem right in my own former district. The Government is proposing to declare excess about 10,000 acres of Army installations at Aberdeen and Edgewood. You will have this all over again. I don't know of any local pressure to do this. The local pressure would be all against it. But for some mysterious reason the GSA wants to do it. The Army is resisting it. The GSA wants to do it. I think you want to make sure if there is anything that happens like this that the Government does not lose a profitable asset so that some local people can make a lot of money. In the cases of Aberdeen and Edgewood I am convinced, and everyone else is up there, that will become a big industrial development, if declared excess.

Mr. SIKES. And in a little while they would want more land for more development. That is the history of these things.

Mr. LONG. Yes; the Government poured millions into the area and it would be a great shame if we lost that. The Navy does not want to get out. That is my understanding.

NAVY DIRECTED TO VACATE

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have been ordered to get out, Mr. Long.

Mr. LONG. The Wall Street Journal has an article saying that the Navy definitely does not want to get out.

Admiral MARSCHALL. We don't want to get out. We have a range there for which we have gone to considerable expense. It works fine. There have been no problems as far as safety and operating conditions. We are under pressure to get out.

Mr. LONG. Why should we? Why do we have to give in to every pressure?

[Discussion off the record.]

Mr. SIKES. Industry has been in nontax status if it moves to Puerto Rico.

Mr. LONG. Yes; every type of break there is. Bootstrap, in the sense that people are pulling themselves up, is a marvelous concept. I really think that some reexamination, of the pressures, how strong they are, and why we should give in to them would be in order and that we should not just cave in, because if we cave in here we could cave in all over the place.

Mr. SIKES. I fully agree that it does not appear to me to be sound logic to give up Culebra. This committee has not been consulted about it.

The decision is being made presumably within the administration and the Navy has been directed to get out. I think it is as simple as that.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Mr. Chairman, the basis of the direction was that there had to be an alternate site to which to go. The Congress is going to have the final say in the matter because, in order for us to go to these two islands, there must be funding from the Congress.

Mr. LONG. I certainly would vote against it unless there was some much better reason than has been advanced here.

FUNDING OF RANGE RELOCATION

Mr. SIKES. In Japan when we give up areas that the Japanese want, they have built alternate facilities for us. Wouldn't it be fair, if Puerto Rico wants us out of Culebra, that they should build alternate facilities for the Navy, Dr. Long? Wouldn't that be a reasonable alternative?

Mr. LONG. I agree certainly. It is always a good test whether anybody wants something; that is, whether he will pay for it. People will want almost anything if it is free. If you charge for it they back up in a hurry.

Mr. SIKES. If this committee should not fund an authorization, what would you do?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I think we would very well have to stay where we are, or cease operations entirely, one of the two.

Mr. SIKES. I assume this is an essential range.

Admiral MARSCHALL. Most essential, sir.

As a matter of interest we have gone from using explosive rounds at Culebra to the so-called puff rounds which gives the simulated effect of an explosion but which is not an explosion.

Mr. MARKON. I was about to remark that there are several bills pending before the Senate and the House authorizing the appropriations for this particular move.

Mr. SIKES. I am sure of that.

Mr. MARKON. I believe when the bills are considered the decision will be made as to who pays for the move.

Mr. LONG. Whose bills are they?

Mr. MARKON. Senator Baker introduced a bill and he had 20 cosponsors.

[Discussion off the record.]

ALTERNATE FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Please check the record on this, admiral, and be sure we have complete answers on the questions on Culebra and the alternate plans, and the cost, and the impact on range efficiency.

Admiral MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

(1) The training functions now carried out at Culebra and surrounding cays are:

Northwest peninsula of Culebra

Naval gunfire support (NGFS) training with inert ordnance.

Twin Rocks and Cross Cay

Air-to-ground training with inert ordnance.
Cross Cay has instrumented target.

Fungy Bowl Cay

Air-to-ground training with live ordnance.

Luis Pena Cay

Observation post and profile tracking radar to monitor air-to-ground training.

NGFS training can be conducted simultaneously with training at all of the air-to-ground targets except Cross Cay. Air-to-ground training is conducted only at one of the three air-to-ground sites at a time. The latter targets are approximately 1.3 to 3 miles off the northwest peninsula of Culebra.

(2) Comment on relocating the above functions:

An accurate appraisal of the probability of diminished efficiency of training operations at Desecheo/Monito is not possible until ongoing staffing of a relocation plan is completed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In general, it appears at the present time that the NGFS target area and three air-to-ground targets, observation posts, profile tracking and surveillance radars and other support facilities would be located on the 360 acre island of Desecheo. Two of the air-to-ground targets could be utilized simultaneously although aircraft track separation will be at the minimum allowable safety distance. None of the air-to-ground targets could be used simultaneously with the NGFS targets. The utilization of Monito Island as a missile target is highly desired but is dependent upon the availability of portions of the island of Mona for logistic support and command and control purposes. There will be no improvement in the overall efficiency of training operations through a move to the Mona Passage. The extent of any reduction in training operations efficiency is being investigated.

Mr. LONG. If the Chairman would yield for one more question: Has this been brought up before the Armed Services Committee and discussed adequately there?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have not gone before the committee yet, Dr. Long.

Mr. LONG. It does seem to me that before we do anything at all we ought to hear from them.

Mr. SIKES. Yes. There is nothing pending for us to do in this budget.

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. This is just a discussion. There is no request for funds.

We are trying to keep abreast of the situation.

Mr. DAVIS. When you said, Admiral, that the Navy has been ordered out, by whom?

Admiral MARSCHALL. The Secretary of Defense, sir, on the basis that there must be an alternate location which to go. I read the statement which appeared in the press and essentially he said he had made the decision for the Navy to leave Culebra and move to these other two islands.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND

Mr. SIKES. Who owns the other two islands?

Mr. MURPHY. I can speak to that. This island Desecheo is owned by the United States. It has been a former bombing range target used by the Air Force. It has been inactive for some time. The other island, Monito, is owned by the Government of Puerto Rico.

Mr. SIKES. Do they propose to sell it to us while we give them Culebra?

Mr. MURPHY. The arrangements for possible exchanges Mr. Markon can speak to.

Mr. MARKON. I think one of the conditions announced by Secretary Richardson is that the land would be made available to the United States. There is no contemplation of sale but a donation for this use.

Mr. DAVIS. Then the Puerto Rican Government would become the owner of the U.S. Government-owned land on Culebra?

Mr. MARKON. Yes, sir, most of that land is Crown land, that is, land we acquired under the treaty with Spain. Under the law, when it is no longer needed for Government purposes, title reverts to the Commonwealth.

Mr. LONG. If the Chairman would yield, we have no assurance at all that in a decade or so someone may get his eye on those two beautiful islands, and decide they want those too, after we have put many millions of dollars of equipment and facilities on those.

Mr. SIKES. That is to be anticipated.
Mr. DAVIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

ENLISTED DINING FACILITY

Mr. SIKES. You are requesting $1,442,000 for an enlisted men's dining facility. How many men will be eligible to use this facility?
Mr. MURPHY. This facility will serve a new complex of bachelor enlisted quarters, both Navy and Marine Corps. The total capacity of those buildings is 1,030 men. They are theoretically all eligible to eat at this facility. However, our experience has been that somewhat less than everyone will eat. So our facility is scaled from 781 to 1,100 men capacity.
Mr. SIKES. Is this a replacement or an addition?
Mr. MURPHY. It is a replacement, sir.
Mr. SIKES. Is it large enough to meet your long-range needs?
Mr. MURPHY. Yes. sir.
Mr. SIKES. What will you do with the existing facility?
Mr. MURPHY. The existing mess will be demolished.
Mr. SIKES. What is the area cost factor?
Commander KIRKPATRICK. 1.5, sir.

DINING FACILITY LOCATION

Mr. SIKES. Now, will you show us the location of the dining facility?
Mr. MURPHY. The mess hall will be located in the Offsite area. The present mess to be demolished is also in that area. These are the new barracks under construction that I mentioned earlier.
Mr. SIKES. What is the distance between them, a quarter of a mile?
Mr. MURPHY. Less, sir; from the barracks to the dining area will be perhaps an eighth of a mile. The present mess is here also.
Mr. SIKES. Now tell us about land acquisition.

LAND EXCHANGE

Mr. MARKON. Mr. Chairman, this item is to provide the protection to the effluent operations of the facilities These facilities are receiving antenna which are very sensitive to all sorts of electronic noise.
Mr. SIKES. Where is that on the large map?
Mr. MARKON. This is a larger map of the northern coast of Puerto Rico.
Mr. SIKES. What is the total acreage and the cost?
Commander KIRKPATRICK. 1,700 acres is the project, and 1.244 million is the cost. It is anticipated to be a land exchange.
Mr. MARKON. This is an unfunded item This is a land exchange.
Mr. SIKES. For what will this be traded?
Mr. MARKON. Most of the land colored in gold is owned by the commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In carrying out our announced plan of 1971 to relocate from the San Juan Naval Station to Roosevelt Roads we will be excessing a lot of land into the San Juan area and we will use the lands to trade off with Puerto Rico for this unfinished project.
Mr. SIKES. Discuss the need for this land acquisition fully for the record.

[The information follows:]

This project is for authorization to acquire by exchange an easement in approximately 1,700 acres of land adjacent to the Sebana Seca Security Group Station. The facilities on this station are sensitive receiving antennas that require an electromagnetically quiet area within a radius of 5,720 feet. When the site was selected in 1949, the area surrounding the station was undeveloped and free of any adverse radio noise. Development in recent years indicates that the character of the neighborhood will change. This easement to be acquired will control the impending development so that the operational efficiency of the facility will not be degraded. The easement will restrict the density of residential units to single dwellings with a maximum of one house per every 5 acres and preclude the use of industrial or other activity that would generate electronic radio noise such as arc welding.

Mr. SIKES. You have given it a priority of 86; how urgent is it?

Mr. MARKON. During the last 8 years, land in the vicinity has been drained and reclaimed with substantial development. The development trend around the city of San Juan is toward the west in the direction of the receiver station. The present noise level is approaching the maximum 2 micro volts per meter which is the existing criteria for this type of operation. The land is presently vacant and undeveloped. If permanent restrictions are not acquired soon, we may be forced to acquire improvements at a much higher cost. Also, this acquisition authorization is coincident with our disposal activity in connection with the disestablishment of the naval station at San Juan. It is contemplated that the easement interest will be acquired from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in exchange for some of the naval station lands at San Juan on an equal value basis.

NAVAL FACILITY, GRAND TURK, THE WEST INDIES

Mr. SIKES. We will place page II–112 in the record.

[The page follows:]

Naval Facility, Grand Turk, West Indies, $1,145,000

This facility perform classified oceanographic research.

The electric power and water project will replace obsolete generators and an obsolete World War II desalination plant with an efficient electric power and water plant.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$1,960,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	1,528,000
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	1,747,000

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Electric power and water plant $34,138	$34,138	42

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL FACILITY

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET	3060-775	GRAND TURK, THE WEST INDIES

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1954	-	560 MILES NORTHWEST TO MIAMI, FLORIDA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide oceanographer research, classified under Code CAESAR.

Major Function:
Oceanographic Research

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	10	120	19	0	0	3	4	0	156
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	10	103	18	0	0	4	4	0	139

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	190	190
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	76* - 0#	(0* - 0#)	2,326	2,326
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				2,516
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				689
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,145
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				477
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				4,827

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
811.10	ELECTRIC POWER AND WATER PLANT	67-	LS	-	1,145	-	1,145

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $1,145,000 for an electric power and water plant.

Do you rely solely on your own sources for electricity and water?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. May we see a map showing this location?

Mr. MURPHY. We have a small one, that shows its location with regard to the new Bahamas Commonwealth area circled in red. You notice it is external to the Bahamian Government area. It remains a British colony. Our agreement for tenure remains in effect.

Mr. SIKES. For how long?

Mr. MURPHY. For 99 years under the original agreement.

Mr. SIKES. Did this agreement become effective in the early 1940's?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. This remains British property?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Not a part of the Commonwealth?

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir, not associated with the Bahamian Government.

Mr. SIKES. Are there no local sources of electricity and water on which to rely?

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir. Grand Turk Island is a very small island, sparsely inhabited producing salt. There is no local source of water or power available to our naval facility.

Mr. SIKES. What record of generator breakdown can you provide to justify this requirement? Provide similar data on the water plant.

[The information follows:]

GENERATOR BREAKDOWNS

In the past 12 months the 5 obsolete generators have had 15 months casualty downtime over the 60 generator months. This is a generator breakdown rate of 25 percent of the time. Due to age and condition of the generators, the maximum design load of 100 kW per generator must also be reduced to 80 kW Generator breakdown time is over and above time for taking units off the line for routine maintenance, or scheduling one unit down for overhaul at all times. It is also noted that the BOQ and barracks are being air-conditioned, under prior year

projects, and if the new generators are deferred, the additional power requirement cannot be met. The air-conditioning will add some 66 tons of cooling capacity, or an added peak electrical load of about 230kW.

Mr. SIKES. What is the present capacity of the waterplant?

Admiral MARSCHALL. This remote station depends for fresh water on a combination of catching rainwater during the short rainy season and storing it, plus the production of freshwater from seawater. The existing desalinization plant is a converted evaporator from an old destroyer. Its capacity is required to supplement the rainwater. This unit normally produces about 6,000 gallons per day, but was originally designed to produce 12,000 gallons per day. For the past 2 years the plant has been not operating reliably due to a lack of spare parts. During the past 2 years the naval facility had a good rainy season and was able to store sufficient freshwater to get by during the dry season. This year is developing into a normal dry year, with only 20,000 to 40,000 gallons of rain being caught during the dry months. This is far short of the normal 200,000 gallons per month.

Mr. SIKES. Are there further questions?

Mr. DAVIS. This map that we have here shows Turk Island with Jamaica in parenthesis under it. Is there any significance to that?

[Discussion off the record.]

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Davis, these islands were administered by Jamaica up to 1962 but they are now administered by the British Colonial Office.

Mr. DAVIS. In other words, when Jamaica got its independence this did not go with it?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. That's all, Mr. Chairman.

ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA

Mr. SIKES. Insert page 114 in the record.

[The page follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization Project Amount	Authorization Installation Total	Appropriation Project Amount	Appropriation Installation Total
ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA				
Bermuda				
Naval Air Station, Bermuda (LANTFLT)				
P-108 Air/Underwater Weapons Compound (216.55-LS)	1,725		1,725	
P-110 Power/Water Plant Expansion (811.10-1500 KW)	1,285		1,285	
		3,010		3,010
Cuba				
Naval Complex Guantanamo Bay, Cuba				
Naval Hospital, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (BUMED)				
P-105 Air Conditioning (510.10-LS)	633		633	
Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (LANTFLT)				
P-188 Electric Generating Plant (811.25-LS)	7,158		7,158	
P-187 Electrical Substations (812.10-LS)	585		585	
		8,376		8,376
Iceland				
Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland (LANTFLT)				
P-240 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10-288 MN) (46,368 SF)	2,834		2,834	
P-241 Bachelor Officers' Quarters (724.15-103 MN)(49,543 SF)	3,258		3,258	
		6,092		6,092
TOTAL - ATLANTIC OCEAN AREA		17,478		17,478

1/ See Classified Book for requirement statement

NAVAL AIR STATION, BERMUDA

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Bermuda. Insert page 115 in the record.
[The page follows:]

NAVAL AIR STATION, BERMUDA, $3,010,000

This activity is in an Atlantic Fleet all-weather ASW patrol air station.

The air/underwater weapons compound project has a classified mission.

The power/waterplant expansion project will provide production and electrical power capacity to meet programed increases in demand. The existing water production equipment is obsolete and nonrepairable and the electrical system will be overloaded this coming year.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973, $1,761,977.
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual), $1,283,122.
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated), $1,417,326.

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Air/underwater weapons compound	$30,000	20
Power/water plant expansion	52,660	30

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL AIR STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET	1450-120	BERMUDA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1941	-	8 MILES SOUTHWEST TO HAMILTON

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the Operating Forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Activities Supported:
One ASW Patrol Squadron (rotational)
NAS Annex
NF Bermuda
Marine Barracks

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	184	1,247	857	0	0	0	0	0	2,288
b. PLANNED (End FY 1979	171	1,364	924	0	0	0	0	0	2,459

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	3,370	3,370
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	1,438	(0)	83,875	83,875
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				87,245
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY			(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 9,081,000)	187
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM			(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)	3,010
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS			(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $11,400,000)	5,738
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				96,180

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
216.55	AIR/UNDERWATER WEAPONS COMPOUND	36 -	LS	-	1,725	-	1,725
811.10	POWER/WATER PLANT EXPANSION	1 -	KW	1,500	1,285	1,500	1,285
				TOTAL	3,010		3,010

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. What is the basis for the increased power need?

Mr. MURPHY. The increased needs are projected based on the construction of new family housing on the NAS, Bermuda. Also, last year we received approval for a tactical support center complex at this station, also additional load.

Mr. SIKES. Is air-conditioning required on Bermuda?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir, it is. It certainly is.

Mr. SIKES. What is done with the salt residue in the desalination process?

Mr. MURPHY. We use a flash-type system in this plant. The solution, after the fresh water is extracted, we return a brine liquid solution to the sea.

Mr. SIKES. Were there protests?

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir.

NAVAL COMPLEX, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

Mr. SIKES. We will insert page 118 in the record.

[The page follows:]

NAVAL COMPLEX, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, $8,376,000—NAVAL HOSPITAL, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

This hospital provides general clinical and hospitalization services to eligible personnel on the Naval Base Guantanamo.

The air-conditioning project will modernize and partially replace the existing air-conditioning system to relieve patient discomfort caused by high humidity and temperatures.

NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

The electrical generating plant project will provide a new turbine, boiler and salt water conversion unit to increase power production to meet anticipated power demand and to increase water production to eliminate the problem of water rationing.

The electrical substation project will increase power production to meet anticipated growth and to relieve current overloading of the existing system during the summer months of peak loading.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$14, 653, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	8, 292, 869
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	17, 084, 638

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Air-conditioning	$30, 384	5
Electric generating plant	290, 000	2
Electric substations	35, 000	16

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMPLEX

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	VARIOUS	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1903	-	120 MILES SOUTH TO KINGSTON, JAMAICA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide, as appropriate, logistic support for the operating forces of the Navy and for dependent activities and other commands as assigned.

Major Activities Supported:

Naval Base
Naval Station
Naval Air Station
Naval Security Group Activity
Fleet Marine Force
Weather Service Environmental Detachment
Dental Clinic
Navy Hospital
Fleet Training Group
Dependent Schools
Marine Barracks
Coast Guard
Naval Investigative Service

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 1972	414	4,360	4,731	0	0	400	5,600	0	15,505
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	332	3,852	4,731	0	0	400	5,600	0	14,915

13.

INVENTORY	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	21,714	21,714
b. LEASES	28,817	2/YR	60,428	60,428
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				82,142
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY	(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $4,247,000)			17,088
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM	(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)			8,376
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS	(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $6,080,000)			15,893
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				123,499

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND PRIORITY c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
	NAVAL HOSPITAL						
510.10	AIR CONDITIONING	1 -	LS	-	633	-	633
	NAVAL STATION						
811.25	ELECTRIC GENERATING PLANT	1 -	LS	-	7,158	-	7,158
812.10	ELECTRICAL SUBSTATIONS	23 -	LS	-	585	-	585
				TOTAL	8,376		8,376

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is to air-condition the hospital, an electrical generating plant, and electrical substations.

AIR-CONDITION HOSPITAL

Has this hospital never been air-conditioned?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It has been partly air-conditioned, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Does this complete the project?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir, this will complete it. According to what we have here, the existing system is less than 50-percent effective. It gives us no flexibilitiy for error.

Mr. SIKES. I would think you would certainly need complete air-conditioning for a hospital in Guantanamo Bay.

You are also requesting funds for a power generating plant.

HOUSING

When are the 150 housing units there to be completed?

Captain REED. They are completed now as far as the contract.

Mr. SIKES. Are additional units required?

Captain REED. According to our 1974 survey we do have a deficit down there of another hundred or more houses which we expect to program in the forthcoming year.

Mr. SIKES. When is the enlisted men's club to be completed?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. It has been completed.

Mr. SIKES. Is it adequate?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

BARRACKS

Mr. SIKES. When do you plan to request funding for barracks?

Admiral MARSCHALL. We have no barracks projects planned at the present time.

Mr. SIKES. What are you using now?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. There are fairly new barracks on the main station. Over on the air station side there may be a need for rehabilitation work.

Mr. SIKES. You can complete that for the record?

[The information follows:]

BARRACKS MODERNIZATION

A project is being considered for the fiscal year 1976 MILCON program to modernize and convert seven permanent open-bay barracks at Guantanamo Bay to one-, two and three-man rooms, in accordance with the Secretary of Defense and Navy policy of improving living conditions for our all-volunteer force personnel. The project is estimated to cost $3.6 million. The modernized barracks will have a capacity of 500 men.

UTILITIES REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SIKES. I would like a general discussion of the situation in Guantanamo. Are the facilities generally adequate?

Where are the facility weaknesses? We have not had many requests in Guantanamo for some time. Show us the map and discuss the general picture there.

Mr. MURPHY. Our immediate facility requirements center on our utility problems as reflected by a submission this year. Since 1964 we are completely dependent on our own water-producing facilities by which we extract fresh water from sea water. Our powerplants are scattered in four individual powerplants as shown on the chart. The thrust of our programing is to center and concentrate our generating capability in the main plant, plant No. 4. Two of the other three plants, have been there since the early 1940's and the equipment in there is essentially junk at the moment. This project in 1974 will permit these plants to be retired, disassembled, and in case of the least aged plant over here, No. 3, to keep that in standby status. The airfield facility is complete and capable of supporting our aircraft requirements. The barracks at the airfield site are in need of rehab and we expect in possibly 1976 to have a rehab project there.

Mr. MCKAY. I have a question there, Mr. Chairman. If these power units are now essentially junk, how are you going to keep one of them on standby?

Mr. MURPHY. This plant No. 3 with three 750 KW units are the better diesel equipment items left. We feel some units here can be retained for intermittent use. However, the first two plants which date from 1942 are diesels that are just worn out.

Mr. MCKAY. They are not quite junk yet?

Mr. MURPHY. Not yet, in plant No. 3.

We are keeping them in running but we are in urgent need of this additional 7500 KW turbine in our main plant to enable us to retire this old diesel equipment.

Mr. MCKAY. Are distances a factor so that you exaggerate your potential for the transmission of power with one centralized power unit?

Mr. MURPHY. Transforming up to 34,000 volts, at that potential this is a reasonable area to cover, yes, sir.

Mr. MCKAY. What is the area that you serve?

Mr. MURPHY. The whole area is roughly 10 miles across this way from borderline to borderline of our reservation. It is about 6 miles north and south. The central plant, operating on a steam basis, gives us auxiliary uses for the steam in our water production plants. It is an efficient and logical arrangement to center our water production and power production by steam at this one location.

Mr. MCKAY. What are you doing for water production now?

Mr. MURPHY. Since 1964, when we were first confronted with producing our own water, we installed three 750,000-gallon per day evaporators. These have been in almost constant use and have been repaired and are being repaired. The solution is a fourth unit, giving us four at 750, to give us a capability to put certain of the equipment down for maintenance and still meet our daily demand.

AIR-CONDITIONING

Mr. SIKES. What buildings other than a part of the hospital are not air-conditioned?

Mr. MURPHY. I would say the new BEQ's are all air-conditioned. The school that you approved last year will be air-conditioned. Certain of our camps—Camp Buckley—contains mobilization-type structures where the Fleet Marine Force maintains its barracks. Many of

those facilities are mobilization type, and the marines are in a training status at times, so they are not air-conditioned. Of course, the new family housing is air-conditioned.

Mr. SIKES. What about messing facilities, are they air-conditioned?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, the mess is air-conditioned.

Mr. SIKES. The clubs?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, I believe all the clubs. Possibly not the chiefs' clubs.

Mr. SIKES. Are the club facilities adequate, all of them?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir, they meet our standards. Some structures are old but they meet standards.

GYMNASIUM

Mr. SIKES. Do you have adequate gymnasium facilities?

Commander KIRPATRICK. Sir, a lot of the gymnasium activity is done outside. At the moment, I cannot recall a gymnasium structure.

Mr. SIKES. Provide the information for the record and tell us if it is up to date and adequate.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

GYMNASIUM

Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay has no gymnasium. The base has numerous clubs, outside recreational areas, and bowling alleys in the recreation building. Due to the hot sun and dust, an inside gymnasium is required. This project is currently unprogramed, at an estimated cost of $1.4 million.

PERSONNEL STATUS

Mr. SIKES. Tell us something about general conditions there. What is the normal tour of duty at Guantanamo Bay?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Unaccompanied, 1 year; and it is 2 or 2½ for accompanied.

Mr. SIKES. What is the number of Cuban employees that go and come each day?

Mr. MURPHY. Sir, the Cuban commuter number is dropping down. It is approximately 214 at the moment.

Mr. SIKES. Dropping down because of their desire or ours?

Mr. MURPHY. It drops as the people on the rolls at the time of the break in relations retire. We said we would discontinue that practice, those people are retiring and the numbers are dropping down.

Mr. SIKES. Would you like to recruit more?

Mr. MURPHY. Not necessarily, sir. We have support with quite a few Jamaican nationals who come here to live and work on the base.

Mr. SIKES. What about more Cubans?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. I am not sure the agreement with the Cuban Government would allow more than those that worked at the base at the time of the break in diplomatic relations.

Mr. SIKES. The Cuban Government needs the money.

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We do not object. The Cuban Government allows those who were working at the time of the breaking of diplomatic relations to remain there and attrite over the years.

Mr. SIKES. Has any effort been made to have the agreement brought up to date so that additional Cubans could work there if we wanted them?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Not to our knowledge, sir. We will check and find out.

Mr. SIKES. It would not cost as much as it costs to import Jamaicans, would it?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Probably not. No doubt it would not.

Mr. SIKES. Provide the information for the record.

[The information follows:]

No change in the treaty agreement is required or anticipated.

The hostile attitude of the present Cuban Government toward our presence makes it impossible to determine the amount of Cuban labor available, or even when the Government will allow Cubans to apply for work. The Cuban Government permits only those Cubans formerly employed to continue U.S. employment on a commuting basis. This source of labor supply is gradually diminishing, as families are permitted to leave Cuba, or as for personal reasons, the commuters discontinue employment.

NAVAL STATION, KEFLAVIK, ICELAND

Mr. SIKES. Turn to Keflavik. Please insert page II–123 in the record.

[The page follows:]

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland., $6,092,000

This station supports Navy antisubmarine warfare patrol squadrons units, USAF aircraft and weapons stations and a USAF fighter interceptor squadrons.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide living quarters for 288 men currently living in inadequate overcrowded facilities. There are no local community facilities available for bachelor personnel. This project will relieve a critical bachelor enlisted housing deficit at this isolated location.

The bachelor officer quarters project will provide modern living quarters for 103 men currently living in inadequate overcrowded facilities. There are no local community facilities available for bachelor personnel.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$69,628,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	57,318,555
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	58,581,874

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters	$75,000	17
Bachelor officer's quarters	53,721	31

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NS, Keflavik, Iceland

1.	Effective BEQ requirement	1973
2.	Adequate Assets	
	Installation	1122
	Community	-0-
3.	Deficit	851
4.	Fiscal Year 1974 project	288
5.	Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	563

Current Bachelor Officer Status at NS, Keflavik, Iceland

1.	Effective BOQ requirement	307
2.	Adequate Assets	
	Installation	15
	Community	-0-
3.	Deficit	292
4.	Fiscal Year 1974 project	1103
5.	Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	189

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET	6029-440	KEFLAVIK, ICELAND

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1951	-	23 MILES NORTHEAST TO REYKJAVIK

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS: NAVAL AIR STATION (HOST)

Maintain and operate facilities to provide services and material in support of specific requirements of the Operating Forces of the Navy and the other Military Services as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Activities Supported:
- ASW Patrol Squadron Units
- USAF AC&W Stations and Fighter Interceptor Squadron
- Naval Communication Station
- Naval Facility Keflavik
- International Ice Patrol and Aircraft Operations

Major Functions:
- Support ASW elements of Naval Operating Forces
- Provide enroute support for airlift operations

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	249	2,537	107	0	0	132	387	0	3,402
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	266	2,570	99	0	0	133	359	0	3,427

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	22,978	22,978
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	23,245* - 0#	(1/YR* - 0#)	182,210* - 0#	182,210
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				205,188
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)		18,010
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $6,000,000)		6,092
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)		10,159
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				239,449

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	-	SF	46,368	2,834	46,368	2,834
724.15	BACHELOR OFFICERS' QUARTERS	-	SF	49,543	3,258	49,543	3,258
				TOTAL	6,092		6,092

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

924

Mr. SIKES. The request is for $6,092,000 for bachelor officer quarters and bachelor enlisted quarters.

U.S. TENURE IN ICELAND

There seems to be a continuing question about our presence in Iceland. Should we spend this much money until we know definitely that we are going to stay?

Admiral MARSCHALL. There has been concern about our tenure in Iceland, and Iceland has now gone to NATO and begun the 6-month discussion period with us which could result in our leaving. This is a matter of public information. After the 6 months of preliminary discussions, if they want us out, we have 1 year to do so under the treaty. The projects we have presented here today would certainly not be started before the 6-month period is ended, and we feel that in addition to being a firm requirement were we to stay, the projects are an indication that we want to stay.

BACHELOR QUARTERS

Mr. SIKES. How serious is the need? We are not going to fund a project unless there is an emergency requirement for it and unless we know we are going to be there. How serious is the need?

Mr. MURPHY. The need is serious, sir, in both the enlisted and officer housing areas for bachelors in Iceland. They presently utilize—the enlisted—12 structures built by the Air Force when they were the host in Iceland in the early 1950's. They are crowded. The rooms are small. They are dark. The heating systems are substandard. They have central head facilities. It is our purpose here to construct a new BEQ that will permit us to pull ourselves up by our bootstraps, if you will. We can download these existing barracks into the new building and follow on with a program of rehabilitation of these old Air Force structures. These projects in this year's program will permit us to take the first step of moving people out of those old buildings while we rehab them. The situation is bad. A man assigned here is afforded little chance for liberty in the local environment. He stays on the base practically his entire year. It is dark, cold, and bleak, with not much chance for outdoor recreation.

Mr. SIKES. How long is the tour of duty for the various categories of personnel stationed here?

[The information follows:]

TOUR OF DUTY IN ICELAND

Bachelors: Bachelor officers and enlisted men, and married personnel serving an unaccompanied tour without dependents, are assigned for 1 year.

Married: Married personnel accompanied by their dependents serve a normal tour of 2 years.

COSTS

Mr. SIKES. There are noticeable differences in costs between the BEQ and BOQ support facilities. For example, you plan to spend $47.95 per foot for electrical lines at the BEQ and $36.67 per foot at the BOQ. There are similar differences in the cost of the electrical substation, telephone and alarm lines, water distribution lines, sanitary sewer

lines, and the square yard cost of parking, sidewalks, and roads. Why are there differences in price for similar items?

Mr. MURPHY. A comparison of cost estimation documents prepared for the Keflavik BEQ and BOQ projects shows the same basic supporting facility costs were used for both projects. The difference in costs shown on program documents results from different design conditions which require varying combinations of elemental parts to make up each supporting facility. For example, the electrical distribution lines are made up of varying lengths of underground ducts, two different sizes of cable and rigid steel conduit, poles and connecting fixtures. Minor differences in costs for the substation, telephone and fire alarm lines are occasioned by slightly different hookup conditions. A higher cost for the BOQ waterline is shown because two fire hydrants are required for installation with the line while no additional hydrants are required with the BEQ waterline.

Mr. SIKES. Are there questions?

Mr. LONG. Apparently, for some time the Navy has paid three times the cost for construction projects in Iceland. I want to know for the record (1) what projects have been constructed at Keflavik for the past 5 years, their costs, and who the contractor was.

[The information follows:]

NAVY CONSTRUCTION

All Navy constuction in Iceland is performed by the Iceland prime contractor in accordance with the Defense Agreement of 1951 as amended by the Memorandum of Understanding of 1954.

The following projects have been authorized for construction during the past 5 years:

Fiscal year:

1969—Antisubmarine classification and analysis center	$138,000
1970—Dependent school-grade	2,834,000
1971—Public works shop	2,600,000
1971—Hospital	6,202,000
1971—Commissary	1,811,000
1972—Runway extension	5,800,000
1973—Runway navigational aids	1,297,000

NAVAL SUPPORT GROUP ACTIVITY, KEFLAVIK

1969—Operations building addition	715,000

NAVAL FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE NAVAL STATION, KEFLAVIK

1970—100 units—New housing	3,551,000

IMPACT OF U.S. BASES ON ICELAND'S ECONOMY

Mr. LONG. Also provide an analysis of how the base at Keflavik is of tangible benefit to the people of Iceland, by employment on the base, by the local economic stimulus, and by participation in military construction projects.

[The information follows:]

ROLE OF THE KEFLAVIK BASE IN THE ECONOMY

Although the economic benefit from the base is not indispensable to the economy, it does play a role in Iceland's attainment of the highest standard of living among the OECD countries (except the USO). The American mili-

tary presence added $16.3 million in foreign exchange earnings in 1972 or 2.5 percent of the GNP.

Approximately 3,250 Icelanders owe their employment to the base: 750 are directly employed; 500 are employed by the Icelandic prime contractor; and 2,000 derive employment from servicing the base.

Military construction on the base ($13 million projected for fiscal year 1973) accounts for a considerable, though lessening, input into the Icelandic economy. Major Icelandic companies contracting base services (shipping, transport, fuel, and so forth) are heavily supported by our presence.

Mr. McKAY. In our overall planning is it necessary that we stay, or is this a kind of diplomatic thing we are hanging to?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Iceland is probably one of the great strategic spots in the whole world.

Mr. McKAY. In light of our modern equipment and all the rest?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Even more so in light of our modern equipment.

Mr. SIKES. If there are no other questions, we will take up the European area.

EUROPEAN AREA

Mr. SIKES. Insert pages II–126 and 127 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization		Appropriation	
	Project Amount	Installation Total	Project Amount	Installation Total
EUROPEAN AREA				
Crete				
Naval Detachment, Souda Bay (NAVEUR)				
P-115 Aircraft Parking Apron (113.20-55,555 SY)	2,666		2,666	
P-144 Air Passenger/Cargo Terminal (141.11-14,470 SF)	554		554	
P-444 General Warehouse (442.10-31,500 SF)	531		531	
P-762 Enlisted Men's Club (740.63-8,200 SF)	402		402	
		4,153		4,153
Italy				
Naval Air Facility, Sigonella (NAVEUR)				
P-143 Photographic Building (141.60-5,680 SF)	328		328	
P-222 Public Works Shop Stores (219.25-LS)	81		81	
P-746 Gymnasium (740.43-10,700 SF)	484		484	
P-765 Officers' Club (740.60-8,200 SF)	443		443	
P-767 Chief Petty Officers' Club (740.70-4,500 SF)	324		324	
P-900 Utility Systems Improvements (812.10-LS)	1,426		1,426	
		3,086		3,086

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization		Appropriation	
	Project Amount	Installation Total	Project Amount	Installation Total
EUROPEAN AREA (CONTINUED)				
Scotland				
Naval Security Group Activity, Edzell (COMNAVSECGRU)				
P-009 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (721.10-20,559 SF)	868	868	868	868
Spain				
Naval Station, Rota (NAVEUR)				
P-390 Tactical Support Center (141.90-658 SY)	85	85	85	85
TOTAL - EUROPEAN AREA		8,192		8,192

1/ See Classified Book for Requirement Statement

NAVAL DETACHMENT, SOUDA BAY, CRETE, GREECE

Mr. SIKES. We will place page 128 in the record.
[The page follows:]

NAVAL DETACHMENT, SOUDA BAY, $4,153,000

Naval Detachment, Souda Bay is strategically located in the eastern Mediterranean and provides facilities for shore and carrier based patrol, logistics, and combat aircraft operating in support of the 6th Fleet.

The aircraft parking apron project will provide the apron space required for 5 P-3 patrol planes and for transient carrier-based aircraft that will use the base as part of the increased antisubmarine warfare mission. No existing facilities are available.

The air passenger/cargo terminal project will provide a facility for processing air cargo and fleet personnel moved into this area of operations. Operations are increasing which make the present hangar space being used unsatisfactory.

The general warehouse project will provide a facility to accommodate increased logistics support. Existing facilities are limited and inadequate.

The enlisted men's club project will support the increased personnel loading that is part of the additional mission assigned to this base. Existing facilities are inadequate to meet the demand.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973, $5,308,000.
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual), $531,000.
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated), $2,654,000.

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Aircraft parking apron	$154,628	4
Air passenger terminal	32,132	4
General warehouse	30,798	3
Enlisted men's club	23,316	4

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL DETACHMENT

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, NAVAL FORCES EUROPE	1312-915A	SOUDA BAY, CRETE, GREECE

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1959	-	10 MILES NORTHEAST TO KHANIA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the operating forces of the Navy and other activities and units as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Functions:
- Perform aircraft maintenance and operational service
- Provide special air logistics support
- Support carrier-based aircraft as required
- Support elements of deployed ASW Patrol Squadrons

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	4	93	0	0	0	22	69	0	188
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	4	102	0	0	0	108	466	0	680

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED				0
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	PRESENTLY USING FOREIGN COUNTRY'S AIRFIELD			0
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				0
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				5,308
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				4,153
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				0
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				9,461

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
113.20	AIRCRAFT PARKING APRON	-	SY	55,555	2,666	55,555	2,666
141.11	AIR PASSENGER/CARGO TERMINAL	-	SF	14,470	554	14,470	554
442.10	GENERAL WAREHOUSE	-	SF	31,500	531	31,500	531
740.63	ENLISTED MEN'S CLUB	-	SF	8,200	402	8,200	402
				TOTAL	4,153		4,153

DD, FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. SIKES. The request is for an aircraft parking apron, a passenger and cargo terminal, a general warehouse, and an enlisted men's club.

ELIGIBILITY FOR NATO INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING

Which of these projects are partially or fully eligible for NATO infrastructure funding?

Mr. MURPHY. Three of the projects at Souda Bay are considered eligible for NATO infrastructure funding; the parking apron, the air terminal, and the warehouse facility.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could you expand in the record on which of those are partially eligible and which are fully eligible?

[The information follows:]

INFRASTRUCTURE ELIGIBILITY

Only the parking apron proposed in fiscal year 1973 MILCON is considered fully eligible for NATO infrastructure funding. The air terminal and warehouse projects are considered only partially eligible, with exact amount of eligibility to be determined during forthcoming program review by SHAPE.

Mr. SIKES. Can you provide for the record a breakdown of the cost of the apron and terminal projects between what is required for cargo missions and for other missions?

[The information follows:]

The aircraft parking apron project can be subdivided as follows as to mission:

Cargo mission (apron), 20,000 square yards	$700,000
Other mission (apron), 35,555 square yards	1,238,000
Other mission (taxiway, etc.), landing strip	728,000
Total cost	2,666,000

The air terminal project can be subdivided as follows as to mission:

Cargo mission, 7,720 square feet	$228,000
Other mission, 6,750 square feet	326,000
Total cost	554,000

DATE NEED IDENTIFIED

Mr. SIKES. When did it first become apparent to the Navy that aircraft parking aprons and cargo terminal spaces at Souda Bay were not adequate?

Mr. MURPHY. The shortcomings in the existing Souda Bay parking apron and air logistics facilities first manifested themselves during the Jordanian crisis of September 1970. A heavy influx of logistics and land-based ASW aircraft supporting naval units deployed in the far eastern Mediterranean occurred at that time. Detailed planning studies were undertaken on-site in early 1971, with a final development plan approved by CINCUSNAVEUR in May 1971. Approximately 60 percent of the projects in this development plan, some $5.3 million, were approved in fiscal year 1973 MILCON. The balance of the projects, $4.1 million, are proposed in fiscal year 1974 MILCON.

Mr. SIKES. Let us suppose that immediately following the Jordanian crisis, in late 1970, the Navy had taken steps to include apron and cargo terminal projects in the NATO slice program. Would the beneficial occupancy date for these facilities have been delayed substantially beyond the date on which you hope to get them by including them now in the fiscal 1974 military construction request?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir, we feel by programing in 1974 we will advance the completion date attainable through the NATO process.

The Jordanian crisis alerted us to our shortcomings in Souda Bay in late 1970. We sent a team of planners into the area and they came up with a list of projects required at that location to support our logistics operations properly. That process took until around April or May of 1971. We had a firm identification of our need.

We then turned to the NATO area. The NATO slice or the NATO program that was in the cycle process at that time was slice 23. We in effect had no access or no capability of getting our projects in slice 23, since that was already locked in by host countries and by SHAPE. So we turned to slice 24, and have anticipated getting some of these projects in slice 24. Slice 24 funding is available generally to the host country, in this case Greece, in early 1974. It has been traditional in executing the NATO program that the host countries are slow in their design process. We would expect that they would take another year for design and two to construct, meaning that we would have obtained our facilities in early 1977.

By the MILCON prefinancing route we feel we are beating that by at least 2 years.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You spent some time in identifying your requirements here. Presumably you could have simultaneously taken some steps to get these included in the NATO program, had the Navy been interested in getting the Souda Bay projects funded through the NATO infrastructure program. As it was you just missed the slice 23 program by a week or so. Presumably, if you had gotten off your mark, you wouldn't have done that. Second, you are citing the average time to construct NATO infrastructure slice projects. As these Souda Bay projects are generally recognized as being valid requirements, there might not be that much delay. Funding through slice 24 will basically be available at the same time or earlier than funding from the regular 1974 program. There have been NATO infrastructure projects which have been built in a couple of years. Presumably if the Navy had said we have got to get these through infrastructure, this 2-year delay that you are talking about might have been considerably shortened. Is that a fair statement? In fact, if they were in slice 24 now they might be available considerably earlier.

Mr. MURPHY. The competition within the 14-nation facility requirements is keen and the infrastructure funds are limited.

Mr. NICHOLAS. That is true of military construction, too.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir, it is similar. Regarding projects for slice 24, it looks like, at the moment, only, part of the photo building project before you in 1974 MILCON and the message center prefinanced last year will be picked up in the NATO slice 24.

USE OF PREFINANCING

Mr. NICHOLAS. Once you have decided on prefinancing it kind of takes off the heat on NATO. They do not have to pay you back for 3 or 4 years because you won't have all your audits in. There is no rush to get an urgent project into the slice program because you have already said we will take care of it.

Mr. MURPHY. There is no question that it reduces the heat. Our move to prefinance was driven entirely by the CNO desire to improve that logistics capability in the eastern and central Mediterranean where he found the fleet operating most of the time. A year or 2 years he felt was unacceptable in view of contingency situations that had arisen and may occur in that area. He felt a year or two was that important.

Mr. NICHOLS. You did have a request there last year. Presumably if this had been that urgent and time had been that critical you might have included these projects as late additions in 1973 or as DOD emergency fund projects?

Mr. MURPHY. The parking apron in this year's program is one of the more critical projects which we considered including in 1973 but just could not fit it in. So we can tolerate a squeeze in type of operation for a limited time.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The thing I was particularly interested in, and I have talked to the people over there, is that there was a general recognition that if they had really pushed ahead with this apron they would have gotten it reasonably soon through NATO infrastructure. And these projects are the types of things that NATO does construct.

Mr. MURPHY. As I say, in the fall meeting last year in Brussels, which was the 24-slice meeting with SHAPE, we did not fare too well. We got the photo building in slice 24. In preparing for this year's meeting in slice 25 we have indications of approximately $8 million acceptance already by SHAPE and apparent willingness to keep it in the slice 25 book when it is firmed up this fall. That is some $8 million of these projects we are prefinancing. We are optimistic about slice 25.

SOUDA BAY USE AGREEMENT

Mr. MCKAY. Under what treaties, agreements, et cetera, do we have tenure at Souda Bay?

Mr. MURPHY. We have a facilities-use agreement with the Hellenic Air Force by which we maintain a presence. This is the Souda Bay Airfield on this map. Our facilities-use agreement permits us to occupy this corner of the field on an individual basis. The Hellenic Air Force operates on the other side.

Mr. MCKAY. What is the term of that agreement?

Is that year to year, 6 months, or what?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. We have a long-range agreement with Greece which was made effective in 1953 and remains in force as long as the NATO treaty is valid.

PARKING APRON

Mr. MCKAY. Can you discuss the various programs which will increase your aircraft parking apron needs here? Will this project complete the requirements? Will future increments be funded by NATO rather than prefinanced?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, essentially our aircraft apron program is as you see in the chart. The two blue segments comprise our parking needs. Those are needs for the foreseeable future. This portion here

will support cargo and logistics aircraft, bringing supplies and people and passengers into Souda Bay to be fanned out to the fleet. The other segment is for our P–3 land-base patrol aircraft that presently are stationed at Sigonella. This availability will permit the basing of five of these aircraft at this forward location where they will be more efficiently deployed. At the present time they utilize these taxi strips which are too small for the aircraft and not adequate by number. Beyond that when the CV concept is in operation and the carriers have the CV air wing aboard, they will be periodically interested in putting some of their air wing ashore. We feel that apron will be adequate to take care of some of their planes. The P–3's will then have to go back and temporarily squeeze in on this segment. Essentially that compromises our apron program.

SOUDA BAY'S IMPORTANCE

Mr. McKAY. What is the distance from Sigonalla to Souda Bay?

Mr. MURPHY. Roughly 500 miles. CNO realized that Sigonella was a logical place to develop a good strong logistics base and also improve the Souda Bay facility because Sigonella is right in the center of the Mediterranean area. Most of the fleet operations for the past several years are centered here.

Mr. McKAY. Souda Bay is the central point of your naval activity?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir, in the eastern Mediterranean. Sigonella is central to the entire Mediterranean.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the Navy have anything on Cyprus?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir. I will provide that information for the record.

(The information follows:)

CYPRUS

The U.S. Navy maintains a small naval facility located with the American Embassy at Nicosia. The mission is to assist in the operation of the State Department radio relay facilities.

NAVY PREFINANCING AND RECOUPMENT

Mr. MURPHY. With regard to the Navy prefinancing record, currently eligible for common funding but not included in the slice, they total $13.5 million. Much of this outstanding amount stems from our recent MILCON prefinancing actions. We recouped $1.2 million over the past year. Of the $13.5 million eligible, the photo lab project is expected to be included in slice 24 and some $8 million additional will be submitted this fall to SHAPE and we are given indications that this $8 million will be included in the slice 25 program. So essentially we could be down to $4 or $5 million for slice 26. We pursue that vigorously. As I say, there is a lot of competition with other countries for projects other than naval bases which is the category we compete in.

ELIGIBILITY AND CONSTRUCTION OF SOUDA BAY PROJECT

Mr. DAVIS. Do we have a pretty good commitment that this is something that is approved, generally speaking, subject to our later getting it into a slice as the money becomes available?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir, those that we designate as eligible we have assurances. They serve two or more countries' common needs, they support forces that we have committed. Concerning barracks or a recreation facility, we must build on our own. That is unilateral action. But aprons and operational facilities are generally accepted without any question.

There may be some portions sometimes not accepted as we apply our own Navy criteria and as they look at the NATO criteria. It might be a few square yards less.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. MCKAY. How will the construction of these facilities be handled? Will they surely be eligible for NATO financing at a later date if they are built in this manner?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir, after declaring our intent to prefinance, we would execute these projects using the Corps of Engineers as the construction agent for the Mediterranean area. That construction process does not jeopardize your later right to recoupment at all.

Mr. MCKAY. Is there any more land which you will have to acquire from the Greek Government in order to construct any of these facilities? Are any of these facilities required because you were not able to obtain additional land or obtain joint use of existing facilities?

Mr. MURPHY. No, sir. The land now available to us under the existing facilities use agreement is adequate. This amounts to roughly 100 acres. None of our new facilities are requested because additional land is not available. We are now using to the maximum extent possible facilities on a joint basis with the Greek Air Force. These include runway, taxiway, landing aids, et cetera.

WAREHOUSE NEED

Mr. MCKAY. In view of the large hangar which is available at this location and which is currently utilized partly for storage space, how urgent is the warehouse project?

Mr. MURPHY. The low level of present operations from Souda Bay and the lack of aircraft present make it convenient to use the hangar for protecting presently onhand equipment and supplies from the elements. Once the buildup occurs and aircraft such as the P–3 are on board, the hangar space will be utilized for aircraft maintenance. The vertical clearance of this hangar is adequate for the P–3 tail dimension, making it a valuable asset. The hangar shops project approved last year will be an addition to the building, making it fully suitable for aircraft support.

The Souda Bay hangar will be fully utilized for the function it is designed to serve, upon completion of the overall base upgrade. The hangar will consist of three separate areas, the existing 31,000 SF hangar bay, the existing 3,500 SF squadron admin lean-to, and the new 24,000 SF maintenance lean-to approved in fiscal year 1973 MILCON. The lean-to spaces are subdivided into functional areas and are not suitable for use as warehouse space.

It can be seen on the attached sketches that the large hangar bay area will be fully utilized when the normal aircraft loading of five P–3's and six other logistics aircraft are aboard the station. Note that the hangar will permit up to two P–3's to be enclosed simultaneously,

or one P–3 and one C–130, or one P–3, and a mix of smaller aircraft. This capability is a normal requirement, derived from the base loading anticipated.

The hangar bay is versatile in that it is the "pull-through" type, with double doors. Use of any portion of the hangar floor for fixed storage would negate the operating organization's ability to quickly move aircraft in and out of the hangar. The hangar bay vertical clearance is 35 feet. Storage area vertical height requirement is only 16 feet.

[Sketches were retained in the committee's files.]

[Questions submitted by Mr. Long follow:]

EFFECT OF ATTEMPTED COUP ON NATO TIES

Q. How badly has the Greek commitment to NATO been affected by the recent attempted coup in the Greek Navy?

A. The recent mutiny has surely had impact on the Greek Navy's morale, and the navy has been hurt in the area of quality of officer personnel following the arrest of some of its most competent officers. An assessment of the navy on other Greek Armed Forces' capability in support of NATO is properly the responsibility of the appropriate NATO commander. However, it is felt that the Greek Armed Forces remain fully committed to NATO and are effective and capable in carrying out assigned NATO missions. This has been demonstrated by Greek units participating in the recent NATO military exercises Dawn Patrol and Alexander Express.

FUTURE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN GREECE

Q. Specify for the record what facilities are anticipated in Greece for the next 5 years?

PROGRAM IN GREECE

A. The navy's military construction program includes the following:

Fiscal year 1973 (sec. 202), Elevsis Airfield support facilities	$1,948,000
Fiscal year 1979 (tentative), Nea Makri, electrical power	1,370,000

EVANS AND NOVAK ON HOMEPORTING

Q. Please comment on the following points.

1. Evans and Novak on July 11 claim that today the GAO will testify before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the Navy was not candid on the question of new facilities for the homeporting of the U.S. 6th Fleet in Greece.

2. Evans and Novak say John H. Chafee, then Navy Secretary, wrote Representative Rosenthal on February 19, 1972: "It is currently not planned to expand or build naval facilities other than * * * minor facilities at the airfield * * * We desire to hire and/or lease existing port services, (and) pier space."

3. When Representative Frelinghuysen asked on March 7, 1972 if "there is no expansion of naval facilities, as such, involved," Admiral Zumwalt replied, "Yes, sir."

4. Evans and Novak say the GAO will testify to the following:

a. "Papadopolos is giving the Navy little cooperation, apparently assuming the United States has to do business with him anyway."

b. "The claim that the Navy would not build 'facilities' was so wrong as to approach complete stupidity or deception. Not one but two multimillion-dollar piers, totaling perhaps $30 million to $40 million, will have to be constructed—the first for destroyers, the second (vastly more expensive) for a single aircraft carrier."

c. "Contrary to Chafee's testimony, the Athens Airfield may be unusable, forcing the Navy to use the regular NATO airbase at Crete, 150 miles away, thus piling huge extra expenses on homeporting."

d. "The Navy has already signed an agreement in principle to construct a 'relocatable' pier for more than $3 million at Elevsis, homeport for 6th Fleet destroyers, 'Relocatable' indicates the pier is easily movable, but the word is a euphemism. In fact, the pier, called 'phase 1' of the plan, is built on permanent pilings. To move it would take up to 6 months at heavy expense.

By calling it 'relocatable' the Navy apparently hopes to hoodwink Congress into the belief that it is not a permanent 'installation'."

e. "Moreover, the expense of berthing the carrier at Magara (known as phase 2) will be 10 times greater, involving not only a pier but also 'cold iron capability'—shore installations, including power supplies, which can keep a carrier's services running while its own power supply is cut off."

[The article follows:]

[From the Washington Post, July 11, 1973]

ROWLAND EVANS AND ROBERT NOVAK: "HOMEPORTING" THE NAVY'S 6TH FLEET

Grave discrepancies between formal Navy-estimated costs of the controversial plan to "homeport" the U.S. 6th Fleet in Greece and costs compiled by a secret study just completed for Congress not only threaten the homeporting plan but United States-Greek relations in general.

Much to the concern of the military dictatorship in Athens, this discovery of highly misleading testimony to the House Foreign Affairs Committee by the Pentagon in the spring of 1972 coincides with sudden disenchantment by the Nixon administration with Greek dictator-president George Papadopoulos.

The roots of that disenchantment are found in Colonel Papadopoulos' decision 6 weeks ago to abolish the Greek monarchy. With a "referendum" scheduled for July 29 certain to give Papadopoulos 8 more years as dictator against rising political opposition, the Nixon administration is cooling toward the military regime.

Now, the regime's woes are about to deepen in Congress. The almost unbelievable misstatements made by Pentagon officials (including the astute chief of naval operation, Adm. Elmo Zumwalt) about homeporting costs have infuriated congressional experts aware of the matter. A full rendition next week will be given a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, headed by Democratic Representative Ben Rosenthal of New York. Testifying will be expert witnesses from the General Accounting Office (GAO), congressional watchdog over spending.

On February 19, 1972, John H. Chafee, then Secretary of the Navy, wrote Rosenthal: "It is currently not planned to expand or build naval facilities other than . . . minor facilities at the airfield. . . . We desire to hire and/or lease existing port services, (and) pier space."

Likewise, on March 7 last year Zumwalt told the Rosenthal subcommittee that "we do not have any intention to build military facilities for our ships." When asked by Republican Representative Peter Frelinghuysen of New Jersey whether "there is no expansion of naval facilities, as such, involved," Zumwalt shot back: "Yes, sir."

But the GAO's team of experts, sent to Greece early this year for investigation, came home with a shockingly different story. Their report indicts abysmal Navy planning and Navy failure to do its homework. It even raises a suggestion that homeporting in the Athens area may prove more trouble than it is worth.

Here is the heart of the report:

(1) Papadopoulos is giving the Navy little cooperation, apparently assuming the United States has to do business with him anyway.

(2) The claim that the Navy would not build "facilities" was so wrong as to approach complete stupidity or deception. Not one but two multimillion-dollar piers, totaling perhaps $30 to $40 million, will have to be constructed—the first for destroyers, the second (vastly the more expensive) for a single aircraft carrier.

(3) Contrary to Chafee's testimony, the Athens airfield may be unusable, forcing the Navy to use the regular NATO airbase at Crete, 150 miles away, thus piling huge extra expenses on homeporting.

(4) Worst of all, the GAO experts will testify next week that the destroyers and the carrier may have to be berthed in completely different waters, perhaps 30 miles apart. That would obviate one basic Navy purpose of homeporting: to give families of American seamen a morale-boosting chance to live together.

The Navy has already signed an agreement in principle to construct a "relocatable" pier for more than $3 million at Elefsis, home port for 6th Fleet destroyers. "Relocatable" indicates the pier is easily movable, but the word is a euphemism. In fact, the pier, called "phase one" of the plan, is built on permanent pilings.

To move it would take up to 6 months at heavy expense. By calling it "relocatable," the Navy apparently hopes to hoodwink Congress into the belief that it is not a permanent "installation."

Moreover, the expense of berthing the carrier at Magara (known as phase two) will be 10 times greater, involving not only a pier but also "cold iron capability—shore installations, including power supplies, which can keep a carrier's services running while its own power supply is cut off.

The State Department has not yet approved phase 2, partly because of the deteriorating political situation inside Greece. Whether it ever does will now depend on congressional reaction to the Navy's failure to come clean 16 months ago on the true cost of homeporting and whether President Nixon decides it is time to cut back his huge investment in dictator Papadopoulos.

A. Comments on Evans and Novak Article

On July 11, 1973, Messrs. Evans and Novak published an article in the Washington Post entitled "Homeporting the Navy's 6th Fleet." The article alleges "abysmal Navy planning" and "grave discrepancies" between the costs estimated by the Navy, and those determined by a recent GAO study, to homeport a carrier, six destroyers, and a hospital ship in Athens, Greece. The article charges that Admiral Zumwalt lied to Congress in early 1972, when he originally presented the homeporting plan.

First, the "unbelievable misstatements" to Congress concerning costs. The continuous refinement and on-site determination of costs has resulted in current estimates less than the estimate figures of a year ago. Interestingly enough, the GAO study recognizes that, except for some additional costs identified by GAO, "the Navy's current cost estimates for implementation of the homeporting programs in Greece seem to fall reasonably within the total costs presented to this subcommittee (Rosenthal) during the March 1972 hearing." The Navy, on the other hand, doesn't recognize these "additional GAO costs" since they will be experienced whether the ships and their personnel remain in CONUS or are homeported overseas in Athens. The Navy, in its cost analysis, has properly chosen to use only those costs which are incremental, i.e., those which are over and above existing costs of operation in order to permit a determination, both by the Navy and by other reviewing agencies, of the appropriateness and cost effectiveness of Athens overseas homeporting.

Second, the plan to lease facilities, except for minor items at a Greek airfield as announced by former Secretary Chafee in February 1972, is in fact the plan being followed.

Third, the dialog with the committee concerning no building or expansion of military facilities remains accurate. The Navy, as originally planned, will lease pier space, which has been needed for years for port visits for all 6th Fleet ships.

Fourth, the charge that the Navy advanced their plan for homeporting in Greece with little or at the very best inadequate planning is patently untrue. The thorough planning incident to the development of Athens homeporting included the following major steps:

October 1970—CNO directed initiation of the overseas homeporting planning process.

November 1970—CNO approved objectives and directed a study of options be conducted within the Navy Department.

December 1970—Navywide study completed considering all Mediterranean ports.

January 1971—State briefed and "approval in principle" requested.

February 1971—Site surveys conducted.

June/July 1971—Additional site surveys conducted as requested by State.

December 1971—State approved Athens homeporting for further planning.

January 72—Initial contact with Government of Greece obtained approval in principle. Key congressional committees informed.

Following this extensive planning, the destroyer squadron arrived Athens on schedule in September 1972. The deployment of the carrier/air wing likewise is on track. This will require only the approval of the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations (MILCON) Subcommittees. As shown here, the Navy has followed an orderly, systematic, and very detailed planning process incident to the Athens homeporting initiative, keeping DOD, State and the Congress fully informed of development.

Fifth, the Navy's claim that it would not build facilities remains one of the keystones of the overseas homeporting program. In no way is this claim "so wrong as to approach complete stupidity or deception" as alleged by the article. The Navy has consistently followed the guideline that both the ships and associated naval personnel/dependents would operate and live off the existing economy to the maximum extent possible. Concerning a pier for the destroyers, the Navy plans to lease which is currently under construction at the expense of the contractor. Pier space in Athens has been a major requirement for years. Not only the homeported destroyers, but also visiting 6th Fleet units will be served by this leased facility. Concerning a pier to support carriers in the Mediterranean, the Navy plans to approach NATO to determine the feasibility of such a pier with cold iron capability under NATO infrastructure funding, thus minimizing cost to the United States. At no time has the Navy considered building either of these facilities.

Sixth, Messrs. Evens and Novak charge that contrary to Secretary Chaffee's testimony, the airfield on Crete may have to be used instead of Athens. The Greek Air Force field at nearby Elefsis will be used by aircraft when the carrier is in port for maintenance. From this field, the aircraft will fly to Souda Bay, Crete in which vicinity proficiency flight training will be conducted. The NATO field at Souda Bay has complete training facilities and nothing additional is required. The plan of utilizing both Elefsis and Souda Bay involves less distance—approximately 150 miles—than is necesary for the training of many carrier squadrons in Conus.

Seventh, the "Worst of All" charge concerning the distance between anchorges for the carrier and destroyers illustrates total ignorance of the daily facts of life for people who earn their living aboard ships. Although irrelevant, from the standpoint of operations, the actual distance between anchorages is 10 vice 30 miles. The commuting distance from home to ship for destroyer people will be about 20 miles. Both distances are normal and customary for Navy personnel in Norfolk, San Diego, San Francisco and indeed, in Washington, D.C.

Eighth, the discussion concerning the "relocatable" pier is not of direct concern to the Navy, since it is merely leasing pier space. The fact that the pier is "removable" is result of a requirement by the Greek Government.

Ninth, the allegation that Papdopoulos is giving the Navy little cooperation is untrue. The homeporting effort reflects 20 years of close Greek-United States ties under NATO, and both countries realize the importance of the homeporting effort to the defense of the southern flank of NATO. The Greek Government has, in fact, been extremely cooperative in insuring the success of the Navy efforts which, in turn, insures a common defense under the NATO umbrella.

Finally, although the carrier can survive without a pier, the obvious convenience and the availability of "cold iron" facilities is of tremendous importance. Cold iron reduces wear on machinery and permits more maintenance time. Further, it permits considerably more men to go home at night rather than having to stay on board to operate the ship's powerplant and other utility machinery.

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella, Sicily, Italy

Mr. McKay. Insert page 137 in the record.
[The page follows:]

NAVAL AIR FACILITY, SIGONELLA, ITALY, $3,086,000

Naval Air Facility, Sigonella (NAF), supports shore- and carrier-based patrol and logistics aircraft operating throughout the Mediterranean area on ASW surveillance and airlift missions in support of the 6th Fleet. Carrier-based aircraft also utilize NAF Sigonella for training exercises, operational diverts, and for carrier-on-board delivery (COD) replenishment. The mission of this vital central Mediterranean base is being expanded to include homeporting of a logistics squadron and the activation of a Military Airlift Command terminal.

The photographic building project will provide a photographic laboratory to support the increased level of aerial photo missions, and will replace the existing facility which is too small, substandard and unsafe.

The public works shops stores project will provide a facility to support the increased station maintenance requirements. The existing facilities do not provide adequate space.

The gymnasium project will provide a recreation facility at the airfield area where, presently, no recreational facilities exist. The nearest facilities are 10 miles away.

The officer's club project will provide a facility to accommodate increased personnel loading. The existing facility is too small to accommodate the loading and will be modified to provide living quarters. No off-base recreational facilities exist.

The chief petty officer's club project will replace the existing facility in the administrative area, 10 miles away. The existing facility is too small to accommodate the increased personnel loading and no facilities exist in the administrative area. No community facilities are available.

The utility systems improvements project will provide utilities to the administrative area. Existing utilities are inadequate to provide services to existing facilities and those approved to support the new base mission.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$16, 117, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972	6, 798, 323
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	11, 264, 323

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Photographic building	$19, 024	4
Public works shops stores	4, 698	6
Gymnasium	28, 072	4
Officer's club	25, 694	4
Chief petty officer's club	18, 792	5
Utility systems improvements	82, 708	5

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL AIR FACILITY

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, NAVAL FORCES EUROPE	1312-915	SIGONELLA, SICILY, ITALY

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1959	-	8 MILES NORTHEAST TO CATANIA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Maintain and operate facilities and provide services and material to support operations of aviation activities and units of the operating forces of the Navy and other activities and units, as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Activities Supported:
- Anti-Submarine Warfare Squadron
- Tactical Support Center
- Mobile Mine Assembly Unit
- Naval Detachment, Souda Bay, Crete
- Fleet Weather Central Detachment
- Explosive Ordnance Disposal Unit
- Fleet Logistics Squadron (to be assigned)

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	68	811	306	0	0	89	462	0	1,736
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	143	1,163	338	0	0	91	501	0	2,236

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	8,730	8,730
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	494* - 0#	(8* - 0#)	6,506* - 0#	6,506
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				15,236
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				18,181
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				3,086
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				2,046
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				38,549

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
141.60	PHOTOGRAPHIC BUILDING	-	SF	5,680	328	5,680	328
219.25	PUBLIC WORKS SHOP STORES	-	LS	-	81	-	81
740.43	GYMNASIUM	-	SF	10,700	484	10,700	484
740.60	OFFICERS' CLUB	-	SF	8,200	443	8,200	443
740.70	CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS' CLUB	-	SF	4,500	324	4,500	324
812.10	UTILITY SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENTS	-	LS	-	1,426	-	1,426
				TOTAL	3,086		3,086

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. McKAY. Which projects requested here are partially or fully eligible for NATO funding?

PHOTOGRAPHIC BUILDING—NATO FUNDING

Mr. MURPHY. The fiscal year 1974 project include only one. The photo building at the airfield is partially eligible for NATO funding.

Mr. NICHOLAS. What portion is included in slice 24?

Mr. MURPHY. I will have to provide the exact split out for the record but it is essentially about 50 percent of the building.

[The information follows:]

NATO FUNDING

The portion of the proposed photolab facility being included in NATO slice 23 is $173,000 or 53 percent of the project.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Does this mean that the authorization and appropriation for this project could be reduced by that amount?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No; it is prefinancing that we are talking about. The reason that we will only get 50-percent funding by NATO in the eventuality it is approved, is that our standards are higher than NATO standards in this particular instance.

Mr. McKAY. So you are not going to get more than 50 percent?

Admiral MARSCHALL. That is correct. But we need the facility as presented in order to get full measure of use out of it.

Captain Watson points out that 50 percent supports the NATO mission, the other 50 percent is a national commitment.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Are there P–3's that this activity supports? Are the aircraft this supports fully committed to NATO?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir; it is a P–3 support project.

Mr. McKAY. When were the requirements developed?

Mr. MURPHY. This requirement has been ongoing. We have a photo activity now at Sigonella that is small and substandard. We propose to abandon that facility and utilize that for other functions at the airfield.

UTILITY SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. McKAY. Why is the project to improve the utility system not eligible for NATO funding?

Mr. MURPHY. The reason for that is that those utilities are not at our operating area. I would point out that the base at Sigonella is really two bases separated by roughly 10 miles. This is an operating area where there is a multinational use. However, at NAF–I, which is a cantonment providing sole U.S. housing, support facilities, family housing, schools, and some berthing, the utility improvements are not eligible for NATO. The utilities are centered at this location.

PRIORITIES

Mr. McKAY. All of these projects are listed as being in the bottom 20 percent of your program this year. Are they urgent?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes; they are urgent. I am reluctant to give you my usual comment again, but they did stand the test of the

MILCON program system which we have, and we consider anything that got this far is certainly urgent.

Mr. McKAY. Whether they are near the bottom or not?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Yes, sir. It is very difficult to make a priority list of things that are urgent.

Mr. McKAY. Could you survive if you didn't get them?

Admiral MARSCHALL. I am sure we could survive, Mr. McKay. We can survive just about any time, I think.

Mr. McKAY. Would it impair your efficiency because of the deterioration of the present facilities?

Admiral MARSCHALL. It would impair our efficiency and it would certainly not contribute to the all-volunteer force if we did not get some of these facilities that we have requested.

Mr. McKAY. The urgency is mainly related to the all-volunteer force?

Admiral MARSCHALL. No, sir; that is not the prime urgency at all. That is one of the side features. It is a demonstrated need at Sigonella which withstood the test of our programing system. We feel it is required whether we have an all-volunteer force or not. But in the all-volunteer force we do have to look a lot more carefully at the needs of our people.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. McKAY. What are you currently using for recreation facilities here?

Mr. MURPHY. At present all recreational facilities are at the administrative area, NAF–I, approximately 10 miles from the airfield. They include a gymnasium, swimming pool, and playing courts. At the airfield, where some 500 men will be living, there are no recreational facilities and the proposed gymnasium, in addition to club facilities approved last year, will provide austere inside recreation facilities. A swimming pool for outside recreation at the airfield is being considered for future programing.

RENTAL GUARANTEE HOUSING

Mr. McKAY. What progress has been made in obtaining rental gurantee housing at Sigonella?

Captain REED. During the last year, three studies have been made on the feasibility of 250 units of rental guarantee housing at Sigonella, with the conclusion that rental guarantee housing is not feasible within the present guarantee limits.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, EDZELL, SCOTLAND

Mr. McKAY. Insert page II–150 in the record.

[The page follows:]

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY, EDZELL, SCOTLAND, $868,000

This activity is part of the high-frequency direction finder network, and performs an antisubmarine warfare support mission vital to the security of the Nation.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 115 men currently living in overcrowded inadequate spaces. Community housing is not available.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$3,468,867
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	3,468,867
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	3,468,867

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters	$33,300	1

Current bachelor enlisted status at NSGA, Edzell, Scotland

1. Effective BEQ requirement	307
2. Adequate asset	158
Installation	155
Community	3
3. Deficit	149
4. Fiscal year 1974 project	115
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	34

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL SECURITY GROUP ACTIVITY

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND	5771-325	EDZELL, SCOTLAND

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1960	-	17 MILES SOUTHEAST TO MONTROSE, ANGUS

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Perform Naval Security Group functions as directed by the Commander Naval Security Group and perform other functions as directed by the Chief of Naval Operations

Major Function:
Provide secure communication essential to the defense of the US
Performs Naval Security Group cryptologic functions.

Conducts technical research in support of U.S. electronic research projects.

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	26	443	2	0	0	1	2	0	474
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	32	679	2	0	0	2	3	0	718

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	453	453
b. LEASE AND EASEMENTS	457* - 0#	(42* - 0#)	3,881* - 0#	3,881
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				4,334
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				0
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				868
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				0
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				5,202

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
721.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	-	SF	20,559	868	20,559	868

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

NAVAL STATION, ROTA, SPAIN

Mr. McKAY. Insert page II–152 in the record.
[The page follows:]

NAVAL STATION, ROTA, SPAIN, $85,000

This station provides facilities, services, and material support for the operation and maintenance of naval weapons and aircraft, including Polaris replenishment.

The tactical support center has a classified mission.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$10, 816, 000
Cumulative obligations, Dec. 31, 1972 (actual)	10, 281, 724
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	10, 742, 624

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete, Apr. 1, 1973
Tactical support center	$3, 000	50

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL STATION

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
COMMANDER IN CHIEF, NAVAL FORCES EUROPE	1087-775	ROTA, SPAIN

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1957	-	2 MILES SOUTHWEST TO ROTA

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide facilities services and material support for the operation and maintenance of naval weapons and aircraft for activities and units of the Operating Forces as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations.

Major Activities Supported:
- Patrol, transport, carrier and other fleet aircraft as assigned
- Naval Fuel Depot
- Naval Communication Station Spain
- Ballistics Missile Submarine Replenishment Site
- Naval Hospital, Rota
- Fleet Weather Central, Rota
- Military Airlift Command Terminal

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	407	3,864	1,669	0	0	117	708	15	6,780
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	336	3,726	1,665	0	0	171	742	15	6,655

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	9,287	9,287
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS#	6,375	(3* - 0#)	88,592	88,592
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				97,879
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,442
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				85
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				5,780
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				105,186

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
141.90	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER	-	SY	658	85	658	85

DD FORM 1 OCT 75 1390

Mr. McKAY. Insert pages II–154 through II–156 in the record.
[The pages follow:]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization Project Amount	Authorization Installation Total	Appropriation Project Amount	Appropriation Installation Total
PACIFIC OCEAN AREA				
Australia				
Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth (NAVCOMMCOM)				
P-120 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (722.10-86 MN) (16,656 SF)	1,192	1,192	1,192	1,192
Mariana Islands				
Naval Complex, Guam				
Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam (PACFLT)				
P-117 Transmitter Building (131.50-2,647 SF)	309		309	
P-137 Airfield Lighting Emergency Generator (811.60-200 KW)	79		79	
Naval Hospital, Guam (BUMED)				
P-030 Modernization of Intensive Care Unit (510.10-LS)	177		177	

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization		Appropriation	
	Project Amount	Installation Total	Project Amount	Installation Total
PACIFIC OCEAN AREA (Cont'd)				
Mariana Islands (Cont'd)				
Naval Magazine, Guam (PACFLT)				
P-439 Mine Assembly Facility (216.30-43,434 SF)	3,229		3,229	
P-490 Rocket Maintenance and Assembly Facility (216.50-1,458 SF)	241		241	
P-450 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization (722.10-12,300 SF) (41 MN)	288		288	
P-438 Security Control Facilities (872.10-LS)	1,094		1,094	
Naval Station, Guam (PACFLT)				
P-999 Collimation Tower (217.20-1 EA)	167		167	
P-055 Theater (740.56-1,000 Seats)	1,480		1,480	
P-901 Wharf Utilities-(812.90-LS)	2,782		2,782	
Navy Public Works Center, Guam (CNM)				
P-091 Finegayan Telephone Exchange (131.40-LS)	725		725	
P-092 Water System Improvements (842.15-LS)	417		417	
		10,988		10,988

1/ See Classified Book for Requirement Statement

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM - FY 1974
(ALL DOLLARS THOUSANDS)

Installation and Project	Authorization: Project Amount	Authorization: Installation Total	Appropriation: Program Amount	Appropriation: Installation Total
PACIFIC OCEAN AREA (Cont'd)				
Republic of the Philippines				
Naval Complex, Subic Bay				
Naval Air Station, Cubi Point (PACFLT)				
P-999 Tactical Support Center (141.90-LS)	161		161	
Naval Station, Subic Bay (PACFLT)				
P-219 Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization (722.10-705 MN) (203,394 SF)	1,411		1,411	
P-181 Dependent School Expansion (730.55-32,344 SF)	1,034		1,034	
Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay (CNM)				
P-281 Berthing Utilities Improvements (812.90-LS)	117		117	
		2,723		2,723
TOTAL - PACIFIC OCEAN AREA		14,903		14,903

1/ See Classified Book for Requirement Statement

NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, HAROLD E. HOLT, EXMOUTH, AUSTRALIA

Mr. McKAY. Insert page II–157 in the record.
[The page follows:]

NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, HAROLD E. HOLT, EXMOUTH, AUSTRALIA, $1,192,000

This station provides fleet broadcasts, tactical ship-to-shore and point-to-point communications and supports naval security group operations and the defense communications system.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 86 men currently living in overcrowded barracks.

Status of funds

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$76,977,000
Cumulative obligations, December 31, 1972 (actual)	76,977,000
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	76,977,000

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete Apr. 1, 1973
Bachelor enlisted quarters		7

Current bachelor enlisted status at NCS, Exmouth, Australia

1. Effective BEQ requirement	245
2. Adequate assets	66
Installation	66
Community	0
3. Deficit	179
4. Fiscal year 1974 project	86
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	93

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMMUNICATION STATION, HAROLD E. HOLT

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND	2476-085	EXMOUTH, AUSTRALIA

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1965	-	800 MILES SOUTH TO PERTH

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provides Fleet broadcasts, tactical ship-to-shore and point-to-point communications in support of the Defense Communication System for surface ships and submarines operating in Western and Southern Pacific and Indian Oceans.

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	32	398	15	0	0	1	0	2	448
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	31	405	15	0	0	2	0	2	455

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	7,445	7,445
b. LEASED AND EASEMENT#	18,141* - 0#	(16* - 0#)	74,125* - 0#	74,125
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				81,570
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				1,818
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				1,192
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				262
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				84,842

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	-	SF	16,656	1,192	16,656	1,192

DD FORM 1 OCT 73 1390

Mr. McKAY. Are there problems with our tenure at this base?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. No, sir; there are no problems with our tenure at this location. I might say that the agreement was enacted in 1963 for a minimum period of 25 years and it is extendable.

Mr. McKAY. So we have used 10 years of the 25?

Admiral MARSCHALL. Ten years down the pike. We have 15 more years.

NAVAL COMPLEX, GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. McKAY. We will insert pages 159 and 160 in the record.

[The pages follow:]

Naval Complex, Guam., $10,988,000

Naval Air Station, Agana

This station is a major support activity for fleet and transient aircraft. It supports two fleet air reconnaissance squadrons and an anti-submarine warfare patrol squadron.

The transmitter building project will provide a facility to house new communication equipment and a maintenance shop. Increased air operations require additional space to house communications systems. The existing space is too small to accommodate the additional equipment.

The airfield lighting emergency generator project will provide a building and generator equipment to provide emergency power to airfield lighting and navigational aids. The existing portable generator is old, of insufficient capacity, and unreliable, thus endangering aircraft operations when used.

Naval Hospital, Guam

This hospital provides general clinical and hospitalization services to eligible personnel on the island of Guam.

The intensive care unit project will modernize the existing facility to provide an adequate, basic, clinic for intensive and coronary care patients who currently must use only marginal facilities.

Naval Magazine, Guam

This magazine stores a prepositioned reserve stock of all types of ammunition.

The mine assembly facility project has a classified mission.

The rocket maintenance and assembly facility project will construct an operational facility for the maintenance, inspection, and assembly of anti-submarine and submarine launched rockets. There is no existing facility for this purpose and no existing facilities can be converted.

The bachelor enlisted quarters project will provide modern living spaces for 41 men currently living in substandard, overcrowded, barracks.

The security control facilities project will provide security fencing around the weapons storage area.

Naval Station, Guam

This station provides barracks, messing, recreational, medical, and other personnel and logistic services for home-ported or transient ships and the major military activities located in the Apra Harbor area.

The collimation tower project will provide a facility to periodically calibrate shipboard radar and weapons systems. No such facility exists within 3,000 miles of this base and ships are required to travel 6,000 miles to have these tests performed.

The theater project will provide a 1,000 seat facility and will replace several outdoor theaters where programs are continually interrupted by winds, aircraft noise, and insects. Existing civilian facilities are remote and transportation costs prohibitive.

The wharf utilities project will provide "cold iron" utilities to support ships berthed at this station.

Naval Complex, Guam., $10,988,000 (continued)

Naval Public Works Center, Guam

This center provides public works, utilities, housing, and other support to operating forces, dependent acitvities, and other commands.

The Finegayan Telephone Exchange project will provide a facility to house a new 1,000 line dial control office. Increasing demand for telephone service requires the expansion of existing facilities which are not large enough to accommodate any additional equipment.

The water system improvements project will increase the production of treated water and will improve the existing distribution system to accommodate increasing user demands.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$390,157,500
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	119,556,951
Cumulative obligations, June 30,,1973 (estimated)	125,319,382

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Transmitter building	$16,377	12
Airfield lighting emergency generator	3,931	17
Modernization of intensive care unit	8,050	5
Mine assembly facility	97,799	3
Rocket maintenance and assembly facility	13,755	13
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization	12,656	31
Security control facilities	15,000	27
Collimation tower	2,500	22
Theater	11,042	20
Wharf utilities	33,000	14
Finegayan telephone exchange	6,770	19
Water system improvements	16,170	20

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NM, Guam

1. Effective BEQ requirement	2,881
2. Adequate Assets	11
Installation	-0-
Community	11
3. Deficit	2,870
4. Fiscal Year 1974 program	288
5. Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	2,582

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMPLEX

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	VARIOUS	GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1898	-	-

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

The Guam Naval Base Complex provides waterfront, airfield and other support for antisubmarine warfare detection and operations; communications for all military services on Guam, including ships in the Central Pacific area; port services for transient and home-ported ships; voyage repairs; and complete supply for the Fleet including fuel and ammunition.

Major Activities Supported:

Naval Station
Naval Air Station
Ship Repair Facility
Naval Magazine
Naval Communication Station
Naval Hospital
Naval Supply Depot
Public Works Center

12.

PERSONNEL STRENGTH	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 1972	703	6,766	4,029	0	0	36	119	9	11,662
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	1,025	7,928	3,918	0	0	81	367	9	13,328

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	25,406	1,709	333,706	335,415
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	6,499* - 437#	892* - 229#	77,842* - 298#	78,369
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				413,784
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY	(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $22,757,000)			47,869 1/
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM	(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $28,800,000)			14,225 1/
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS	(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)			48,940
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				524,818

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
	NAVAL AIR STATION, AGANA						
131.50	TRANSMITTER BUILDING	-	SF	2,647	309	2,647	309
811.60	AIRFIELD LIGHTING EMERGENCY GENERATOR	-	KW	200	79	200	79
	NAVAL HOSPITAL						
510.10	MODERNIZATION OF INTENSIVE CARE UNIT	-	LS	-	177	-	177
	NAVAL MAGAZINE						
216.30	MINE ASSEMBLY FACILITY	-	SF	43,434	3,229	43,434	3,229
216.50	ROCKET MAINTENANCE AND ASSEMBLY FACILITY	-	SF	1,458	241	1,458	241
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	-	SF	12,300	288	12,300	288
872.10	SECURITY CONTROL FACILITIES	-	LS	-	1,094	-	1,094

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMPLEX, GUAM, MARIANA ISLANDS

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS (Continued)

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
	NAVAL STATION						
217.20	COLLIMATION TOWER	-	EA	1	167	1	167
740.56	THEATER	-	SE	1,000	1,480	1,000	1,480
812.90	WHARF UTILITIES	-	LS	-	2,782	-	2,782
	NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER						
131.40	FINEGAYAN TELEPHONE EXCHANGE	-	LS	-	725	-	725
842.15	WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	-	LS	-	417	-	417
				TOTAL	10,988		10,988

1/ INCLUDES $3,237,000 FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390c

Mr. McKAY. What is the area cost factor?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. 1.8 for the Guam area.

Mr McKAY. What are the missions of the Naval Air Station, Agana?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Naval Air Station supports our land-based P–3 antisubmarine warfare aircraft.

Mr. McKAY. What are you currently using for a transmitter building here? Is there no other suitable space available?

Mr. TAYLOR. We are currently using a combination transmitter-receiver facility. It is too small to accommodate the installation of additional equipment which is being delivered in May 1974. There is no other space available which can house this function.

Mr. McKAY. What are the deficiencies in security at the naval magazine at the present time here?

Mr. TAYLOR. At the present time we do not meet criteria for the storage of special weapons at this location. We have only one perimeter fence around the area. We have gaping holes underneath the fence where water has washed out and left us holes that people could use to intrude. We need to generally upgrade the security for the storage of our special weapons.

Mr. McKAY. What is the requirement for a rocket maintenance and assembly facility?

Mr. TAYLOR. Ships that use Guam carry the new antisubmarine rockets on board. There is no facility on Guam to maintain or assemble these particular weapons. Therefore we require a facility to assemble the rocket motors, warheads, and guidance components which are stored on the island.

Mr. McKAY. What is the nearest base to this?

Mr. TAYLOR. The nearest base would be Subic Bay, which is approximately 1,600 miles to the west. We have a general map of the Pacific Ocean area to orient you. This will give you some idea where Guam is physically located within the Pacific Ocean. Looking to the east, our closest other base is Pearl Harbor in the vicinity of 3,900 nautical miles.

Mr. McKAY. What is your program to provide theaters on Guam?

Mr. TAYLOR. In last year's program we had a project for the naval air station to provide a theater. In this year's program we are requesting a theater for the naval station. In some future program we will request a theater for the naval communications station. At the present time all theaters are the outdoor-type theater. In other words, movies are just shown outdoors with no closure for the patrons. Frequent rainstorms, noise from aircraft, insects—all these things interrupt the showing of movies. Therefore, we are requesting that we replace these outdoor theaters with indoor facilities.

Mr. McKAY. You don't have any inside facilities at all there?

Mr. TAYLOR. Only the small 200-seat hospital theater. The 1973 project approved for the naval air station will be our first indoor movie theater.

Mr. McKay. Will the wharf utilities complete the requirements for ships to be homeported here? Will it complete all requirements?

Captain Watson. Yes, sir, this will complete our cold iron requirements.

Naval Complex, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines

Mr. McKay. Naval Complex, Subic Bay. Insert in the record II–174.

[The information follows:]

Naval Complex, Subic Bay, RP., $2,723,000

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point

This station provides primary support in the Phillippine area for air operations of the 7th Fleet and the 1st Marine Air Wing.

The tactical support center project has a classified mission.

Naval Station, Subic Bay

This station provides port facilities and logistics support to ships operating in the Western Pacific Ocean.

The bachelor enlisted quarters modernization project will provide modern living spaces for 705 men currently living in open bay, domitory type structures affording only minimal privacy for the occupants.

The dependent school expansion project will provide additional teaching facilities to accommodate the large number of school-aged dependent children in the area.

Naval Public Works Center, Subic Bay,

This center provides public works,utilities, housing, and other support to operating forces, dependent activities, and other commands.

The berthing utilities improvements project will replace exposed electrical pier connections with modern connections to eliminate safety hazards and to provide electrical connectors compatible with those issued to ships.

Status of funds:

Cumulative appropriations through fiscal year 1973	$145,761,000
Cumulative obligations, Dec 31, 1972 (actual)	135,000,329
Cumulative obligations, June 30, 1973 (estimated)	137,419,352

DESIGN INFORMATION

Project	Design cost	Percent complete April 1, 1973
Tactical support center	$ 8,564	18
Bachelor enlisted quarters modernization	16,566	15
Dependent school expansion	16,710	24
Berthing utilities improvements	5,206	57

Current Bachelor Enlisted Status at NS, Subic Bay

1.	Effective BEQ requirement	1,438
2.	Adequate Assets	1
	Installation	-0-
	Community	1
3	Deficit	1,437
4.	Fiscal Year 1974 project	705
5.	Remaining deficit after fiscal year 1974	732

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 19 74 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3. INSTALLATION
19 FEB 1973	NAVY		NAVAL COMPLEX

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
VARIOUS	VARIOUS	SUBIC BAY, REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	1901	-	-

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

This Naval Complex provides port services for ships operating off the coast of Southeast Asia and for aircraft carrier squadrons in the vicinity of the Philippines. Services include antisubmarine warfare patrol and operation; combat helicopter support; ship repairs including major overhaul; harbor services; complete supply, including fuel and munitions; and communications for all military activities in the Philippines and ships at sea.

Major Activities Supported:

Naval Air Station	Naval Magazine
Naval Station	Naval Communication Station
Naval Hospital	Public Works Center
Naval Supply Depot	Ship Repair Facility

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			TOTAL
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	(9)
a. AS OF 31 December 1972	518	5,144	12,364	15	21	355	1,912	86	20,415
b. PLANNED (End FY 1977)	459	4,005	12,364	15	21	321	1,712	86	18,983

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	0	0	31,096	31,096
b. LEASES	43	(0)	158,475	158,475
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				189,571
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 4,684,000)		11,845
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 0)		2,723
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS		(EXCLUSIVE OF FAMILY HOUSING $ 6,080,000)		38,619
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				242,758

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION				AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	TENANT COMMAND c	UNIT OF MEASURE d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
	NAVAL AIR STATION, CUBI POINT						
141.90	TACTICAL SUPPORT CENTER	-	LS	-	161	-	161
	NAVAL STATION						
722.10	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS MODERNIZATION	-	SF	203,394	1,411	203,394	1,411
730.55	DEPENDENT SCHOOL EXPANSION	-	SF	32,344	1,034	32,344	1,034
	NAVY PUBLIC WORKS CENTER						
812.90	BERTHING UTILITIES IMPROVEMENTS	-	LS	-	117	-	117
				TOTAL	2,723		2,723

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. McKAY. What is the situation on dependent school facilities here?

Mr. TAYLOR. At Subic the dependent schools are possibly going to lose accreditation because of the lack of facilities. The lack of classrooms causes overcrowding, poor attentiveness, and low effectiveness of teachers.

To properly educate for the student load the school system must have 13 more classrooms and special rooms for remedial reading, music, audiovisual instruction, teachers workrooms, and general-purpose instruction rooms.

Mr. McKAY. How many students per teacher do you have now?

Mr. TAYLOR. Students per teacher, I don't have the figure but I will provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

Student-teacher ratio

Overall classroom ratio	22.9:1
Grade school ratio	26.1:1
High school ratio	17.5:1

Mr. McKAY. What is the bachelor housing situation at the present time?

Mr. TAYLOR. Currently we have a requirement for 1,438 bachelor enlisted berthing spaces. We have existing adequate only one space and that is in private housing. We have 705 existing substandard which can be made adequate, so at the moment we have a deficiency of 1,437 spaces.

Mr. McKAY. This is based on the new criteria for space units?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKAY. Do you feel that your long-range strength projections here are valid?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, we do.

Mr. McKAY. Provide for the record your long-range bachelor housing program.

[The information follows:]

BACHELOR HOUSING AT SUBIC BAY

The entire remaining deficiency of 732 spaces for bachelor enlisted quarters will have to be satisfied by new construction. The current project will modernize all existing usable spaces. A project will be submitted for the remaining deficiency, but as yet no specific fiscal year has been selected.

CONTINUING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. McKAY. Continuing authorizations.
Insert pages II–182 and 183.
[The information follows:]

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—FISCAL YEAR 1974

[In thousands of dollars]

Installation and project	Authorization	Appropriation
Continuing authorizations—Inside and outside the United States:		
Continuing authorization, various locations (FACENGCOM):		
Planning and design		53,800
Urgent minor construction		15,000
Access roads		1,000
Total, continuing authorization		69,800
Total, Navy	630,126	697,400

1. DATE	2. DEPARTMENT	FY 1974 MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM	3 INSTALLATION
15 FEB 1973	NAVY		CONTINUING AUTHORIZATIONS

4. COMMAND OR MANAGEMENT BUREAU	5. INSTALLATION CONTROL NUMBER	6. STATE/COUNTRY
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND	-	VARIOUS LOCATIONS

7. STATUS	8. YEAR OF INITIAL OCCUPANCY	9. COUNTY (U.S.)	10. NEAREST CITY
ACTIVE	-	-	-

11. MISSION OR MAJOR FUNCTIONS

Provide for accomplishment of projects which have Navy wide application and no appropriation limitation.

Functions Included are:

Engineer planning and final design for projects included in the construction program

Construction of minor projects not deferrable until enactment of new legislation

Urgently required off-station roads and improvements

12. PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	PERMANENT			STUDENTS		SUPPORTED			
	OFFICER (1)	ENLISTED (2)	CIVILIAN (3)	OFFICER (4)	ENLISTED (5)	OFFICER (6)	ENLISTED (7)	CIVILIAN (8)	TOTAL (9)
a. AS OF 31 DEC 1972	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
b. PLANNED (End FY 1975)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

13. INVENTORY

LAND	ACRES (1)	LAND COST ($000) (2)	IMPROVEMENT ($000) (3)	TOTAL ($000) (4)
a. OWNED	(CONSTRUCTION COSTS TO BE INCLUDED IN INVENTORY OF			-
b. LEASES AND EASEMENTS	BENEFITING ACTIVITY)			-
c. INVENTORY TOTAL (Except land rent) AS OF 30 JUNE 19 72				-
d. AUTHORIZATION NOT YET IN INVENTORY				-
e. AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED IN THIS PROGRAM				-
f. ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATION - NEXT 4 YEARS				-
g. GRAND TOTAL (c + d + e + f)				-

14. SUMMARY OF INSTALLATION PROJECTS

PROJECT DESIGNATION		TENANT COMMAND	UNIT OF MEASURE	AUTHORIZATION PROGRAM		FUNDING PROGRAM	
CATEGORY CODE NO. a	PROJECT TITLE b	c	d	SCOPE e	ESTIMATED COST ($000) f	SCOPE g	ESTIMATED COST ($000) h
010.00	PLANNING AND DESIGN	-	LS	CONTINUOUS			53,800
020.00	URGENT MINOR CONSTRUCTION	-	LS	CONTINUOUS			15,000
040.00	ACCESS ROADS	-	LS	CONTINUOUS			1,000
						TOTAL	69,800

DD FORM 1 OCT 70 1390

Mr. McKAY. What is the situation at the present time with regard to planning and design funds?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Sir, we are requesting $53,800,000 in the current program.

REPROGRAMING FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

It appears at this time that we may have need for a little additional money, in the neighborhood of $3.5 million to $4 million to complete our fiscal year 1974 requirements.

Mr. McKAY. Will you bring that in on a reprograming action?

Commander KIRKPATRICK. Yes, sir. It is our intent to do that.

Mr. McKAY. Any questions?

[No response.]

OBLIGATIONS BY QUARTER

Mr. McKAY. Provide for the record your quarterly obligations for planning funds for Trident and other programs for fiscal year 1973 and as projected for the next six quarters.

[The information follows:]

MCON PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Total	Trident
Fiscal year 1973:		
1st quarter	4.4	(0.1)
2d quarter	6.2	(.2)
3d quarter	7.9	(.4)
4th quarter	17.5	(.5)
Total	36.0	(1.2)
Fiscal year 1974:		
1st quarter	15.5	(8.7)
2d quarter	8.5	(1.7)
3d quarter	16.8	(5.0)
4th quarter	147.0	(1.0)
Total	57.8	(16.4)
Fiscal year 1975:		
1st quarter	[Deleted]	
2d quarter	[Deleted]	
Total	[Deleted]	

MINOR CONSTRUCTION

Mr. McKAY. Provide for the record the urgent minor construction projects undertaken in the past year and those which are currently under review.

[The information follows:]

Following is a list of minor construction projects authorized under 10 USC 2674 which were funded during 1973:

A. Projects Approved prior to Fiscal Year 1973, funds assigned in Fiscal Year 1973:

LOCATION	PROJECT TITLE	($000) EST. COST
NAVREGMEDCEN Porthsmouth, VA	Toxicology Laboratory	155
NAS Norfolk, VA	Addition to A/C IMA Facs	243
NAVHOSP PHILA, PA	Medical & Surgical ICU's	297
NAVHOSP San Diego, CA	Modernize OB Suite	247
NSY Portsmouth, NH	Industrial Security Fence	160
MCD&EC Quantico, VA	Alterations to Sewage Plant	272
NAVORDSTA Indian Head, MD	Nitrating Fac Restoration	295
NSMSES Pt. Hueneme, CA	AEGIS Support Fac	185
NAVHOSP Gt. Lakes, IL	Drug Screening Lab.	214
NAVHOSP Jax, FL	Drug Screening Lab Addition	296
NAVHOSP PHILA, PA	Alter Main OR Suite	100
	Subtotal Prior Year Approved Projects	$2,464

B. Projects Approved in Fiscal Year 1973, funds assigned in Fiscal Year 1973:

PWC Guam, Mariamas Island	POL Facilities	246
NAVSTA Rota, Spain	Calibration Lab Addition	174
NAVSUPPACT New Orleans, LA	Relocation of Main Gate	178
NAS Meridian, MS	Ammunition Facilities	98
NAVSTA Norfolk, VA	Add. to Elect. Power Pier #12	294
NAVSUPPACT New Orleans, LA	Recruiting and Processing Facility	273
NAVSUPPACT New Orleans, LA	Admin Facilities for Misc. DOD Activities	208
NSF Thurmont, MD	Emergency Power Plant Add.	290
NSF Thurmont, MD	Station Elec. Dist. Improvements	216

CBC Gulfport, MS	Public Works Shop	286
NSY Long Beach, CA	Marine Machine Shop	300
NARF North Island, CA	Aircraft Weapons Alignment	300
NAVHOSP Cp. Lejeune, SC	Replacement of Electrical Substation	99
NAS Bermuda	Replace Incinerator	160
NAD Crane	Environmental Explosive Test Fac	287
COMFLEACT Yokosuka, Japan	Utilities, Berth 12	298
NAVHOSP Cp. Lejeune, SC	Replacement of Electrical Substation	21
MCAS Iwakuni, Japan	Power Check w/Sound Suppressor	185
NADC Warminster, PA	Industrial Waste Lagoons	98
NAS Miramar, CA	FAA Administration Addition	297
MCAS El Toro, CA	Ammo Storage Area Lighting Alarm System	189
NSA New Orleans, LA	Alterations/Improvements to Bldg. #603	298
NSPCC Mechanicsburg, PA	Controlled Humidity Warehouse	117
NAF Figonella, Sicily, Italy	Widen Taxiway	212
NAVSTA San Diego, CA	Alcohol Rehab Center	150
CINCLANTFLT Norfolk, VA	Building NH #21 Conversion Admin Space	300
NAD Hawthorne, NE	Security Lighting-Rail Classification Yard	121
NOF Sasebo, Japan	Ammunition Overhaul Bldg.	24
NTC Great Lakes, IL	Berthing, Small Craft	290
NAVWEACEN China Lake, CA	HARM Facility	299
NMC Pt. Mugu, CA	Microelectronics Facility	296
COMFLEACT Yokosuka, Japan	Dependent School Addition	270
Naval District Washington, Washington, DC	Naval Exchange Facilities	290
Naval District Washington Washington, DC	Film Distribution Library	300
NAVSUPPACT New Orleans, LA	Coastal River Division Berthing Facility	100

NAVTORPSTA Keyport, Wash.	Primary Power Feeder and Distribution System	288
NAVSUPPACT New Orleans, LA	Restaurant Alterations/Additions	260
NAS Whidbey Is., CA	Relocate Small Arms Range	92
NAS Norfolk, VA	E-2C Training Devices	283
NH Bremerton, WA	Alt. Ward "H" Bldg. #428	44
NAVDET Souda Bay, Greece	Adv. Base Facilities	298
NAF Naples, Italy	Avionics Integration Area	297
NMC Pt. Mugu, CA	Seaborn Target Launching Slip	130
NSTC Honolulu, HI	Alterations Bldg. #39	300
NAVSTA Adak, AL	RAWIN/APT Building	49
NAVRADSTA Cutler, ME	Sewage Treatment Plant Improve.	80
NAPTC Trenton, NJ	Fuel Systems Test Fac Alts.	297
MCAS Beaufort, SC	Installation Relocatable Bldgs	93
FAAWTRACEN Dam Neck, VA	TSC Modular Hardstand	97
NAVSTA Pearl Harbor, HI	Alts. Bldg. 193 Human Resources Development Center	225
NRL Washington, DC	Space Flight Systs Lab	39
NAVHOSP San Diego, CA	Modernize OB Suite	53
NAS Oceana, VA	F-14 Addition-Avionics Bldg	100
NAVAIRDEVCEN Warminster, PA	Tactical Support Center Lab.	83
ACCCC Norfolk, VA	Integrated Command Support Ctr	195
MCAS Iwakuni, Japan	Preservation, Packing, Packaging Facility	131
NTC Orlando, FL	Alterations for Women Recruit Quarters	176
NAVBASE Honolulu, HI	Command and Control Fac	293
COMSYSTO Taipei, Republic of China	Commissary Store Conversion	128
NAVHOSP Rota, Spain	Outpatient Clinic	273
PWC Yokosuka, Japan	Boiler Plant Consolidation	280
NAS Alameda, CA	Combination Facility for C-9B Program	80

NSO La Maddalena, Sicily, Greece	Sewage Treatment Plant	163
	Subtotal - FY 73 Approved Projects	$12,391

C. Projects Approved in FY 73; funds not yet assigned:

NAS Memphis, TN	Rehabilitate Training Building	285
FTC San Diego, CA	Exterior Lighting Fire Fighters School	207
NTC Great Lakes, IL	DD 963 Engineering Training Facility	278
NSGA Edzell, Scotland	Dispensary/Dental Clinic Addition	221
NAS Jacksonville, FL	Relocate NAVMARCORPSRESCEN	99
Camp Walker, Korea	WWMCCS Computer Mainframe	299
NAS Whiting Field, FL	Addition/Alteration to A/C Parking	249
MINEWARFOR Charleston, SC	Alterations to AMCM Shop	78
FLEACT Sasebo, Japan	Increase Power Supply, India Basin	254
MCAS El Toro, CA	C-130F Operational Flight Trainer	243
MCSC Barstow, CA	Dynamometer Testing Facility	75
MCRD Parris Island, SC	Infantry Training Facilities	162
NSA New Orleans, LA	Communication Center Expansion	231
	Subtotal - Approved Projects not yet Funded	$2,681
	TOTAL Approved Projects for Funding in FY 1973	$17,536,000

D. Projects under review at the Departmental level on 1 July 1973 planned for accomplishment in FY 1974:

NSC Oakland, CA	Research Animal Breeding and Holding Facility	296
NAS Pensacola, FL	Applied Instruction Facilities (NFO)	299
NAVPERSTRARSCHLAB San Diego, CA	Naval Personnel & Training Research Laboratory	195
NSA New Orleans, LA	Small Boat Berthing	298
FLEACT Sasebo, Japan	Modernize Steam Plant, India Basin	186
NH San Diego, CA	Modernization of Ancillary Service	295
NSA New Orleans, LA	Vehicle Parking	215
NAS Moffett Field, CA	Ground Electronics and OMD Building	300
NAS Moffett Field, CA	VR Squadron Alterations	300
NAS Norfolk, VA	Air Cargo Terminal Improvements	223
	Total Projects Under Review 1 July 1973	$2,607

Mr. McKAY. Have you noticed any major changes in requirements in this area as a result of the revised cost limits?

Mr. NASH. Since the cost limits under the urgent minor construction authority have been raised, there has been a definite upward trend in the average cost of a project. This is not only due to the ability to accomplish a more meaningful scope of work but is also, in large part, due to the acceleration of construction costs, and in overseas areas to the devaluation of the dollar. This increase in average project cost has tended to limit our ability to do any more projects than in previous years particularly in the economic 3-year payback area which we feel has great potential benefits. If costs continue to rise it may be prudent to again review the project limits and program funding level in subsequent legislation.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. McKAY. What access roads projects does the Navy have currently underway, and what is the basis for your $1 million projection for fiscal year 1974? Provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

ACCESS ROAD PROJECTS

The following certified and approved projects are in various states of execution as indicated. It is planned to proceed in the most effective and advantageous manner with these projects, generally in the order of priority listed with prior available funds and the FY 74, NOA of $1,000,000 now before the Congress. Higher priority items pending certification may also be substituted if engineering can be completed.

CERTIFIED PROJECTS FULLY FUNDED

LOCATION	STATUS	CWE
NAS Norfolk VA (Gate 4)	Construction Underway	$ 71,404
NB Charleston SC (So Base)	" "	245,000
NAD McAlester OK	" "	200,000
NAS Fallon NV	" "	422,616
Detachment Alpha, ME	Construction Authorized	32,500
NB Norfolk VA (Fate 3)	Design Complete	2,508,000
NAS Merdian MS	Design Underway	483,000
	Subtotal - Fully Funded	$3,962,520

CERTIFIED PROJECTS PARTIALLY FUNDED

PRIORITY	LOCATION	STATUS	FUNDED	CWE
1	San Diego Housing, CA	Engr. Underway Phase II	$ 34,000	$ 406,000
2	NTC Orlando, FL	Engr. & ROW Underway Phase I	104,359	379,359
3	MCAS Yuma, AZ	Engr. Underway	32,400	365,000
4	Naval Academy, MD	Engr. & ROW Compl--Constr Deferred due Environmental Question	550,000	1,325,000
5	Virginia Beach Housing, VA	Engr. Underway	72,070	300,000
6	NADC Warminster, PA	Engr. Underway	0	1,000,000
7	NTC Orlando, FL	Prelim. Engr., Only, Phase II	0	170,000
		Prelim. Engr., Only, Phase III	0	550,000
8	San Diego Housing, CA	Prelim. Engr., Only, Phase III	0	179,000
		Prelim. Engr., Only, Phase IV	0	105,000
			$ 792,829	$4,779,359

The $1,000,000 additional access roads funds for FY 1974 together with currently unallocated funds in the amount of $609,718 from prior years is projected as the minimum which can keep the most urgent projects going.

Mr. McKAY. Any further questions?

[No response.]

Mr. McKAY. If not, the committee adjourns until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1973.

HOMEPORTING IN ATHENS

WITNESSES

VICE ADM. W. D. GADDIS, U.S. NAVY, DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS)
REAR ADM. F. M. LALOR, CEC, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR, SHORE FACILITIES PROGRAMING DIVISION, DCNO (LOGISTICS)

SUPPORTING WITNESSES

CAPT. R. E. NICHOLSON, U.S. NAVY, DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS)
LT. COMDR. J. B. LEAP, CEC, U.S. NAVY, DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS)
R. J. MURPHY, NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

Mr. SIKES. The committee will come to order.

Admiral Gaddis and gentlemen, we are pleased to have you here today to discuss the requirement for facilities in support of the Navy's home-porting program in Athens. There has been considerable discussion and some dispute with regard to this subject in recent weeks. I think part of the dispute with regard to this program stems from political problems with regard to our necessarily close cooperation with the Government of Greece in this program and because of Greece's strategic importance to NATO and to the United States. These are matters of great interest to this committee.

Another factor which has led to considerable misunderstanding has been the Navy's early assurances that the initiation of home-porting in Athens would involve very little construction of new facilities in support of our forces there. Probably we cannot clear up all of these problems today, but it is well for the committee to try to establish as clear and as detailed a record as possible on what the Navy is now proposing, why you will need certain facilities, whether there has been a change in the program for these facilities, and how you plan for these facilities to be provided. Are you prepared to give us this information?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir; we are, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIKES. I would like for you to proceed in your own way. Do you have a statement?

Admiral GADDIS. If you have no objection, I would like to make a few brief remarks and then attempt to answer any questions that you have.

Mr. SIKES. Very well.

21-007 (Pt. 3) O - 73 -- 62

STATEMENT OF DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS)

Admiral GADDIS. Homeporting is vital to the acceptable performance of the Navy's mission. In recent years we have been required to meet commitments, which have not been reduced, with a force which is being cut to the bone. Moreover it is necessary to recruit personnel from an All-Volunteer Force environment against such persuasive disincentives as prolonged family separation—something the other services do not face as a way of life.

Without such innovations as homeporting, our force is too small and our people will be too few to do the job.

Homeporting in the Mediterranean is of great strategic importance. As has been stated before, our military options in the Mediterranean have been steadily narrowed in recent years. The North Africa littoral is no longer freely accessible to us and we increasingly encounter the presence of the Soviet Fleet. Homeporting in Greece for this reason, and because the Athens area provides both a sufficient population base to accommodate our housing requirements and the physical attributes necessary to the operation of our ships, is a sound and necessary decision.

Our planning for the initiative has been thorough. Moreover, the costs we have experienced to date and those we envision, are most reasonable. In this regard our overall estimates orginally submitted to this committee last year are holding true.

INCREMENTAL COSTS

Last year we predicted incremental costs of $14.4 million one-time and $13.4 million recurring. Our present estimates are $13.7 million one-time and $12.3 million recurring.

Mr. SIKES. Repeat those, please.

Admiral GADDIS. I would note that the GAO has additionally noted a $1 million reduction in the annual recurring costs if we home port due to the reduction in the number of deployments that we would make. While the GAO disagrees with our costing methods, it is my belief—and my conviction—that the GAO's appreciation in this respect is slightly vulnerable.

Throughout the planning and initial implementation of our homeporting initiative we have kept Congress fully informed. In this connection, I, and the Chief of Naval Operations, feel we will have to recommend that, without home porting, the Navy will be forced to recommend reduction of the Navy's commitment to the Sixth Fleet to one carrier task group. The effect of such a reduction will be a serious degrading of both the United States and the NATO military posture in the Mediterranean.

It is neither our intention nor desire to build a naval base in the Athens area. To the extent that we have had to provide additional facilities beyond those originally contemplated we have only done this most grudgingly. We have accomplished phase 1 of our plan and are ready to move into phase 2. This is a necessary, cost-effective move to meet our military commitments in a period of declining forces and tight dollars.

Mr. SIKES. In other words, there has been no change in the Navy's attitude toward the need for home porting in Greece?

Admiral GADDIS. No, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Will you repeat the figures that you gave for the costs anticipated earlier and present projections.

Admiral GADDIS. The costs presented to the Congress in the spring of 1972 envisioned a maximum one-time cost of $14.4 million and an annual recurring cost of $13.4 million. Our experience to date and our projections for the future indicate that we cannot only live within those figures, but on the basis of incremental costs due to the Athens initiative, we anticipate $13.7 million for one-time and $12.3 recurring costs. The $12.3 million excludes an estimated $1 million in transit savings which would make the net annual cost $11.3 million.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You mentioned a figure of $13.7 million for one-time costs?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

DAYS SPENT IN HOME PORT

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have for the record a table showing the number of days in home port for carriers in the Atlantic Fleet, (1) assuming there is home porting in Athens, and (2) assuming that there is no home porting in the Mediterranean.

Admiral GADDIS. I have such a table and would be pleased to provide it for the record.

[The information follows:]

The average number of days in home port per annum for Atlantic Fleet carriers with and without home porting in Athens is as follows:

Time in home port:	*Days*
With home porting	155
Without home porting	127

This is based on a five-carrier force level in the Atlantic Fleet and a commitment to keep two carriers deployed to the Mediterranean.

Mr. SIKES. What is the effect of homeporting on the number of days during which families are separated and bachelor personnel spend at sea or ashore? Provide details on that for the record and discuss it now.

Admiral GADDIS. Just roughly, sir, the present figure for the destroyer squadron that is homeported there now, is about 44½ percent of the time in homeport. The balance of the time is spent at sea or in other Mediterranean ports. It is true that it is necessary to provide some additional support to the bachelors, who do not have the same ties to a family that the married personnel have in the form of recreational facilities and is the kind of support we attempt to provide, whether homeported in Athens or elsewhere.

We will provide in Athens a single-man support compound, which will include hobby shops, enlisted men's club, this sort of thing.

[The information follows:]

The average number of days at sea and ashore per annum for Atlantic Fleet carriers with and without homeporting in Athens, is as follows:

Time in homeport:	*Days*
With homeporting	155
Without homeporting	127
Time in other ports:	
With homeporting	64
Without homeporting	93

Time at sea:

With homeporting	146
Without homeporting	145

This is based on a five-carrier force level in the Atlantic Fleet and a commitment to keep two carriers deployed to the Mediterranean.

SEPARATION OF FAMILIES

Mr. SIKES. The Navy has had a singular problem on separation of families because of the fact that personnel must spend so much time at sea. We are assuming that not only is it important from the standpoint of efficiency of the fleet, but that it is doubly important from the standpoint of bringing additional Navy families together, improving morale, and reducing the time of separation as far as those personnel affected. Elaborate on the answer.

Admiral GADDIS. I will.

[The information follows:]

A Navy attitude survey indicates that family separation is a major cause of low retention as indicated herein:

(*a*) A total of 68 percent of the enlisted and 83 percent of the officers surveyed favor overseas homeporting because it increases time in homeport and reduces lengthy deployments.

(*b*) Also, 13 percent of the enlisted and 11 percent of the officers surveyed would have remained longer on active duty if time in homeport were increased by 1 month per year.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Will the figures which the Navy will supply for the record on the amount of time spent in homeport as a result of homeporting, show an increase in the amount of time spent in homeport for U.S.-based ships as well as the carrier which is to be based in Athens?

Admiral GADDIS. For those carriers remaining in the Atlantic Fleet, Mr. Nicholas, the homeport time would increase from about 34 percent of the time to 42 percent of the time. So it is a benefit to the entire fleet.

EFFECT ON RETENTION

Mr. SIKES. The General Accounting Office cast some doubt on the validity of the Navy's contention that homeporting should increase retention. Will you discuss why the Navy feels retention will be helped by this move? Do you have any statistics to support that?

Admiral GADDIS. On two points. First, our history with homeported ships relative to retention. In every case and in every year since 1968, since we have kept statistics, it favors the ships that are homeported overseas in retention figures. We have a slide that shows that. I would note particularly in Athens that there is some question of the effect specifically in the squadron that is there now. There has been statistically some improvement in the reenlistment rate for those ships. We feel that the sample is not large enough, nor the time period long enough, to be an absolute determinant. As you see on the bottom line there, from 1968 through 1972 this represents somewhere between 40 and 60 total ships, most of them small. We have had a significant improvement in the reenlistment rate, both first term and career, in ships that are homeported overseas.

[The information follows:]

Chart depicting representative first term reenlistment rates within the Navy during fiscal year 1968 through fiscal year 1972:

FIRST TERM REENLISTMENT RATES

	FY 71	FY 72	FY 73	
DESRON 12 (ATHENS)	15%	13%	21%*	(Sept-March)
CRUDESLANT	32%	13%	16%	(Sept-March)
DESRON 15 (YOKOSUKA)	30%	28%	34%	(July-March)
CRUDESPAC	11%	23%	18%	(July-March)

	FY 68	FY 69	FY 70	FY 71	FY 72
ALL UNITS HOMEPORTED OVERSEAS	17%	16%	14%	15%	22%
ALL PAC/LANT FLEET UNITS	11%	11%	6%	10%	18%

*Homeported Overseas.

60068

Mr. SIKES. Altogether about a 50 percent increase?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Our attempt here is to improve the overall Navy reenlistment rate, first term, by 2 or 3 percent. If we can do 2 percent we are winners and we have saved money and improved the status of the Navy.

NUMBER OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED

Mr. SIKES. How many people are we talking about in the Athens homeporting situation, uniformed personnel?

Admiral GADDIS. To date there are some 2,000 uniformed people involved in the Athens homeporting. When we complete phase II of the carrier and support ship it will total about 7,000.

Mr. SIKES. Provide for the record a full discussion and, to the extent possible, back this up with valid statistics of the noted or expected effect of homeporting on retention. Be sure to discuss any benefits of overseas homeporting for both families and bachelor personnel. Show us why you feel they outweigh the disadvantages such as extra cost, lack of amenities for families, language problems, etc.

[The information follows:]

Surveys indicate that extended family separation as a consequence of the deployment of ships overseas has been one of the major reasons for failure of the Navy to retain trained personnel. Homeporting in Athens reduces family separations by increasing homeport time on the order of 30 days a year for Atlantic Fleet carriers.

Statistically, these surveys have been borne out. Homeported ships enjoy a higher retention rate than CONUS-based ships. Specifically; first term reenlistment rates have been:

	Fiscal year—				
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
All units homeported overseas (percent)	17	16	14	15	22
All PAC/LANT fleet units	11	11	6	10	18

The GAO based their doubts of the validity of the Navy's retention predictions on a survey conducted in Athens by GAO personnel. It is the understanding of the Navy that, of some 2,000 Navy personnel there, the GAO received some 60-odd responses to questionnaires they circulated and, as GAO has stated, it should not be considered a valid statistical sample. The survey indicates that 50 percent of the personnel would prefer to be homeported in Greece and 50 percent would prefer the United States. In a similar survey of a much larger sampling of destroyer sailors on the east coast, 50.7 percent indicated they would prefer to remain in their present homeport and 49.3 percent would rather go elsewhere. The point here is that surveys of this nature are rather inconclusive. Historical statistics are much better indicators.

It is difficult to assess at this early stage the degree to which the Athens program has resulted in improved reenlistments. Notwithstanding the fact that our samplings are limited, the initial signs show an encouraging trend. From September 1972 through March 1973 the Athens destroyers have enjoyed a 21.3 percent first-term reenlistment rate as compared to 15.7 percent for other ships in DESLANT. However, it is stressed that homeporting is also required due to reduced force levels. In order to meet commitments with declining force levels, the Navy must homeport one carrier task group in the Mediterranean.

The benefits of homeporting are obvious with regard to both families and bachelors. Volunteer rates indicate that we have sailors with a desire to see the world and overseas homeporting provides that opportunity. Homeporting permits increased family time for the married men, and for the bachelor and married man and his family the opportunity to see the world. Additionally, the Navy Inspector

General recently reported the results of a survey in Athens wherein about 70 percent of the wives/families indicated they would rather be in Athens than not because their husbands are there.

The disadvantages of homeporting have to be viewed in the context of what would it be like without homeporting. The result would be longer deployments and less family time.

CARRIERS IN ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC

Mr. SIKES. There have been allegations made that in the event the Navy's carrier forces were reduced at some point in the future to 12 carriers, 5 would be stationed in the Atlantic and 7 in the Pacific Oceans. This differs from what the committee has been told up to now. Provide for the record whatever plans, operational commitments, or requirements there are which would require this type of deployment. Be very sure to indicate what all of the feasible options are and what sets of circumstances would dictate the deployment I have described.

[The information follows:]

In recent testimony before congressional subcommittees and in correspondence with Members of Congress, the Chief of Naval Operations has referred to the possible future necessity of dividing a 12-carrier total force to 5 in the Atlantic/Mediterranean and 7 in the Pacific This conceptual plan is based on expected continuation of requirements for carrier assets in the Western Pacific (WESTPAC) subsequent to fiscal year 1975 when Navy carrier force levels are scheduled for reduction to 12. At the present time, guidance from the Secretary of Defense, provided in March 1973, establishes the necessity of maintaining three carriers in the Western Pacific. This guidance, although revised annually, is currently projected out through fiscal year 1976. It is in consonance with the recommendations of Pacific Fleet Commanders that three carriers should be maintained in WESTPAC as visible evidence of continuing U.S. interests in the area and to meet assigned contingency responsibilities. In the Atlantic, five carriers can fulfill the Mediterranean commitment to NATO, and the initial contingency mobilization requirements, providing one carrier is homeported in the Mediterranean. This reduction to five Atlantic/Mediterranean carriers would be an undesirable reduction in the Atlantic war-fighting capability. However, the alternative would be to locate six in the Atlantic, six in the Pacific, and routinely deploy one Atlantic carrier to the Pacific with the resultant hardship on personnel.

Mr. DAVIS. You are talking about people both afloat and ashore?

Admiral GADDIS. No sir. This is uniformed personnel involved. The total involved is just over 10,000, through phase III, counting all dependents. I am counting uniformed personnel afloat and ashore in the 7,000 figure.

NAVY THREAT TO REDUCE NATO CARRIER COMMITMENTS

Mr. NICHOLAS. You made the statement that you and the Chief of Naval Operations feel that without home porting the Navy will be forced to recommend reduction of the Navy's commitment to the Sixth Fleet to one carrier task group. Could you spell out a little bit more what the circumstances would be which would require the Navy to do that? Would that be based on the current level of carrier commitments?

Admiral GADDIS. This is based on the projected force level planned for fiscal year 1976, when the Navy is expected to have 12 operating carriers.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Do you know what your commitments will be in fiscal year 1976?

Admiral GADDIS. We have nothing in our plans or nothing from higher authority which indicates any change in our present commitment or deployments either in the Indian Ocean, Mediterranean, west PAC, anything like that.

CARRIER FORCES IN WESTERN PACIFIC

Mr. NICHOLAS. Without getting into the classified area, to what extent is your present commitment dictated by requirements to keep residual forces in the western Pacific in connection with the winding down of the Vietnamese situation?

Admiral GADDIS. The forces in the western Pacific today are the same as those that were in the western Pacific prior to the start of the Vietnamese war.

Mr. NICHOLAS. In terms of the number of carrier aircraft?

Admiral GADDIS. With the one exception being in the mine countermeasures force which is being redeployed to Conus right now.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Comparing the carrier forces which were deployed at that time in terms of the number and capability of aircraft you are comparatively much stronger now.

Admiral GADDIS. At that time we had three carriers deployed and we have three carriers deployed today. The requirement, as you know, is for three carriers on a continuing basis.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Provide for the record the types of carriers deployed and the types of aircraft which were deployed on them in prewar force levels.

Admiral GADDIS. I would be pleased to.

[The information follows:]

The carriers were CVA's consisting of U.S.S. *Enterprise*, U.S.S. *Forrestal*, U.S.S. *Midway* and U.S.S. *Oriskany* classes—the same classes as today. Air wings on each type of carrier were similarly composed as those today in terms of numbers and types of squadrons, that is, 2–VF, 3–VA per air wing with support aircraft numbers approximately the same. In those days, the VA squadrons consisted of A–4 and A–1 aircraft, the VF squadrons consisted of F–4 and F–8 aircraft, VAW squadrons were E–2 and E–1 aircraft, reconnaissance aircraft were RA–5C and RF–8. VAQ jammer aircraft were the EKA–3, and the tanker aircraft were the KA–3. The newer carriers assigned to the Pacific Fleet have a somewhat larger capability than the older classes of ships.

Mr. NICHOLAS. How do they compare in terms of capability of the forces?

Admiral GADDIS. The deployments I speak to are CVA deployments. In other words, first-line carriers. Since before the war, obviously we have put out some *Essex* class CVA's and have a couple more of the *Forrestal* class CVA. We have not at any time, to my knowledge, designated between them as having significantly different capabilities.

The air group embarked, yes; it is tailored to the ship and to the mission, but in general the air group has been in the 70- to 80-plane size group.

Mr. NICHOLAS. But with the newer ships you can deploy more aircraft.

STATUS OF NAVY PLANS TO REDUCE ATLANTIC CARRIER FORCES

Is the basis for your statement that you would have to cut the NATO commitment to one carrier task group based on a larger deployment of carriers to the Pacific than to the Atlantic Fleet? If so, has this been thrashed out through the upper levels of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and this type of thing?

Is this a NATO commitment?

Admiral GADDIS. There is obviously an additional alternative which would be to reassess the strategic commitments of the Navy worldwide rather than just in the Mediterranean. But for simplicity's sake we have put it as the simple alternative relative to the two Mediterranean carrier task groups that we speak of here. The Chief of Naval Operations has stated that it is the Navy's intention to recommend that the aircraft carrier commitment to NATO be reduced by one if homeporting of an aircraft carrier in the Mediterranean is not approved.

SCHEDULE FOR ATHENS HOMEPORTING

Mr. DAVIS. What are we talking about now in Athens, one carrier?

Admiral GADDIS. At present we have in the Athens forces six destroyers, a support ship, U.S.S. *Sanctuary*, and the staff of CTF 60 already in Athens. That is the sum total of phase 1 and 2.

Mr. SIKES. How many people already are in Athens? At what level, what rate will the remaining forces be homeported in Athens?

Admiral GADDIS. At the present we have in the Athens forces six destroyers, one destroyer squadron staff, Commander Carrier Task Force 60, and a fleet support office ashore in town. The total is about 2,000 military and 1,250 sponsored dependents.

Mr. SIKES. They are already there?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. When will the total complement be assigned to Athens?

Admiral GADDIS. Phase 2, which adds to that complement a carrier and the support ship, would bring the force to approximately 7,000, just over 7,000. The dependents would raise to 3,800. The totals would be achieved some 12 to 14 months after final deployment approval.

SELECTION OF ATHENS AS HOME PORT

Mr. SIKES. There has been considerable discussion, particularly in the Foreign Affairs Committee, as to the Navy's reasons for selecting Athens as the home port for destroyers and the carrier.

We don't want to repeat all of this at this time, but I wish you would tell the members of this committee what surveys the Navy made with regard to home porting the carrier and the destroyers.

Admiral GADDIS. Very briefly, I would like to go through the history by which we came to this decision. This started in the fall of 1970, when an in-house ad hoc group was formed in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations to study home porting initiatives. This study looked literally at every port in the Mediterranean for feasibility. Resources were strictly in-house. We evaluated port information, housing information, where available, at the various ports in the Mediterranean, general economic and sociological information and dem-

ographic factors. Costs also were included at this time and costing factors were based on the guidance and assumptions provided, which have never changed for this program.

On December 17, 1970, that study was presented to the CNO for review and approval. It considered several options which looked to the homeporting of zero, one, or two carrier task forces. It reported in detail on those ports recommended for consideration of all of those reviewed. The ports recommended were Rota, Barcelona, Marseilles, Toulon, Gaeta, Naples, and Athens. Other ports, such as Palma, Malta, and Livorno, had been dropped earlier because of multiple overriding problems. One of the basic recommendations was an early milestone plan be ordered to verify the information on selected ports by onsite survey.

On the basis of that study the fleet commanders were consulted and their comments requested. On January 8, 1971, we consulted with the Assistant Secretary of Defense (ISA) on our plan and noted that we required comprehensive port surveys. Approval in principle was requested, and we also requested ASD (ISA) to initiate action with the State Department to obtain appropriate government approval for the first increment of the plan and for permission to make onsite surveys.

The State Department was briefed on the plan on January 15. Because of the international implications associated with the surveys and rejection of any particular area in any country, it was considered prudent to conduct the initial inquiries unilateraly, and we so did.

ONSITE SURVEYS

The onsite surveys began in February 1971 and the results of these surveys confirmed that the Athens area was the optimum site for homeporting a carrier task group with Augusta Bay in Sicily and Taranto, Italy as possible alternatives.

In May 1971, based on advice from the State Department, it was decided to survey 5 additional ports to permit further evaluation. These were ports which we had examined earlier in our study and rejected for various reasons. However, we did pursue these additional port studies. The policy of no contact with respective governments was continued in this phase to avoid the political repercussions that might have occurred in the event a port was not selected. As a matter of fact, we did not formally consult with the Greek Government on the selection of Athens as a site for homeporting until a few days before we came to the Congress to outline our plan. We felt that we needed agreement in principle. but this was an informal thing because we did not want to commit the U.S. Government without consulting with Congress either. Rather, this was the way it was handled. and we have pursued our entire plan since that time on the basis of this procedural rationale.

Mr. SIKES. At what locations were actual onsite surveys conducted?

Admiral GADDIS. The onsite surveys were conducted—I believe I covered those sites. I covered all in my statement expect for those that were requested in addition from State, and I would like to provide those for the record.

Mr. SIKES. That is onsite surveys for a carrier.

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Were any possible carrier homeports rejected without an onsite survey?

Admiral GADDIS. A large number of possible sites were rejected on the basis of preliminary review and only the, as I recall, nine most appropriate were surveyed.

Mr. SIKES. Provide details for the record, where it is appropriate for the record to show these.

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. And for the confidential files of the committee, where that is appropriate.

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

The Navy conducted onsite surveys of the following ports in the Mediterranean with respect to homeporting a carrier:

Athens; Naples; Augusta Bay/Siracusa; Cagliari; Livorno; Gaeta; Taranto; Palermo; and La Spezia.

This was done to objectively verify the results of an extensive in-house study of ports in the Mediterranean with respect to homeporting a carrier task group.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Admiral, are you saying that the Navy did actually make onsite surveys of ports other than Athens?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Naples, Athens, and what else?

Admiral GADDIS. Augusta Bay/Siracusa, Athens, Naples, Taranto, Gaeta, Livorno, Cagliari, Palermo, and La Spezia.

Mr. NICHOLAS. For the berthing of the carriers?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Could you provide for the record the dates for those?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Athens and Naples were surveyed during the period February 14 through 23, 1971, and the remainder of the ports were surveyed during the period June 27 through July 18, 1971.

HOUSING SUPPORT, ATHENS AND NAPLES

Mr. SIKES. I would like to know what the comparative housing situation is in and around Naples and in and around Athens, within approximately an hour commuting time. I would like for the record to have detailed data on price, availability, adequacy, commuting distance, and times from fleet landings. Briefly discuss it now.

Admiral GADDIS. I would like to provide the details for the record.

[The information follows:]

INFORMATION ON HOUSING IN ATHENS AND NAPLES

Athens.—Navy personnel have located adequate housing at reasonable rates in the Athens environs. There are presently some 700 approved units on the housing referral list. The units range in size from one-room apartments to nine-room houses. The average rentals for representative units as of April 1973 are as noted:

	Amount
Furnished apartments	$127.00
Furnished houses	132.00
Unfurnished apartments	129.00
Unfurnished houses	158.00

The distribution of rental housing throughout the Athens environ is such that approximately 21 percent of the Navy families live in the Kifissia/Nea Kifissia/Amaroussion area and 27 percent live in the Glyfda/Voula area. The remainder (52 percent) live in residential areas between those points. The commuting time from Gylfada and Kifissia to the destroyer pier site at Elefsis is approximately 45 minutes and 35 minutes respectively under normal driving conditions. Normal driving time to the proposed fleet landing at Megara is expected to be an additional 20 minutes

Naples.—Residential construction has not kept pace with the population growth in Naples. Increased rental rates in the city have forced Navy personnel to accept inadequate quarters or move to outlaying areas. Average housing costs for apartments and villas are as noted:

Enlisted: Furnished, $255 to 300 per month; unfurnished, $155 to $180 per month.

Officers: Furnished, $300 to $350 per month; unfurnished, $250 to $300 per month.

The average waiting time for housing is 47 days. A housing survey completed in May 1973 indicated that 303 of 565 officers stated their quarters were inadequate and 906 or 1,502 enlisted stated their quarters were inadequate. There are currently five general housing areas in the vicinity of Naples utilized by Navy personnel, with distances from the fleet landing ranging from 4 to 20 miles and commuting times ranging from 25 to 75 minutes during commuting periods.

Admiral GADDIS. As an order of magnitude, the Naples area and the Athens area are comparable insofar as the total housing availability, total population, with the newer and more acceptable housing by Western standards on average being available more in Athens than in Naples. The average cost of housing in Athens that we have experienced in phase 1 is $135 per month, plus utilities. Small apartments average around $70 to $80 a month plus utilities. This is a little cheaper than our community in Naples is experiencing, but not significantly so.

LESSER EFFECT FOR DOLLAR DEVALUATION IN ATHENS

Athens has not had the significant dollar devaluation effect that we have experienced in some other countries either.

Mr. SIKES. Why is that?

Admiral GADDIS. Because the relation of the dollar to drachma has been fairly steady as compared to northern European currencies or, for instance, the Japanese yen.

LEASING AUTHORITY IN NAPLES

Mr. NICHOLAS. Is the Navy requesting additional leasing authority for housing for Naples in the fiscal year 1974 program?

Admiral GADDIS. We have received lease authority for 100 units in Naples; that is, lease points for family housing units in Naples. I know of no additional.

Admiral LALOR. That is fiscal year 1973 authority. It is 100 units in Naples.

MOORING AND BERTHING LOCATIONS IN ATHENS

Mr. SIKES. How do the mooring and berthing locations in Athens compare to other Mediterranean ports, such as Rota, Naples, and Taranto? Provide details for the record in this regard but briefly tell us now.

Admiral GADDIS. We would like to submit the information for the record.

[The information follows:]

MOORING AND BERTHING LOCATIONS

Athens.—Prior to the homeporting of the six-ship destroyer squadron, U.S. Navy ships visiting Athens normally anchored in Phaleron Bay or utilized berths of opportunity on the waterfront in such areas as Piraeus, Hercules, or Skaramanga.

With the advent of homeporting, the Navy is lease constructing a pier near Elefsis for dedicated berthing of the destroyers and *U.S.S. Sanctuary.* Other smaller 6th Fleet ships will use the pier on an opportune basis or moor in the vicinity of the pier. The Elefsis pier site is about 15 miles from the center of Athens. Aircraft carriers and other large 6th Fleet ships will use the proposed anchorage/fleet landing near Megara. The anchorage site has recently been made available to the U.S. Navy by the Greek Government as an alternate to Phaleron Bay as that area, subsequent to January 1, 1974, will be a prohibited anchorage. The Megara site is approximately 30 miles from the center of Athens.

Rota.—Ships visiting the U.S. Naval Station at Rota either berth at the naval station piers or anchor in the adjacent bay. As examples; destroyers would berth at the piers and aircraft carriers would anchor out at a distance of approximately 2 to 3 miles from the piers. The distance from the pier to the center of the naval station approximates 2 miles.

Naples.—Ships visiting Naples either moor in the inner harbor or anchor in the adjacent waters. As examples, destroyers would moor in the inner harbor and aircraft carriers would anchor out at a distance of approximately 2 to 3 nautical miles from the mooring location. The distance from downtown Naples to the mooring location approximates 2 miles.

Taranto.—Ships visiting Taranto anchor or moor in the adjacent waters. Distances from the fleet landing areas vary from less than 1 nautical mile offshore to approximately 3 miles offshore.

Admiral GADDIS. The mooring capability in Athens on an average is generally a little farther from the center of town than most of the ports in the Mediterranean. The center of Athens is, for instance, about 6 miles from Phaleron Bay or Piraeus.

Mr. SIKES. Is this an advantage or disadvantage from the Navy's standpoint?

Admiral GADDIS. From our standpoint, I would say that it is not significant one way or the other. You have the disadvantage of commuting to the center of town for those who want to do so. Conversely, you have the advantage of not being immediately pressed into the mass of traffic that you run into in most ports right off the waterfront.

AVAILABILITY OF AIRFIELD FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. I would like also to have a discussion of the availability of airfield facilities for maintenance during RAV and for proficiency flying in Athens compared with other Mediterranean ports. Detail that for the record, but summarize it now.

[The information follows:]

The Athens homeporting initiative is being implemented under the NATO umbrella and in that regard the Navy has user-ship rights during peacetime of the NATO maritime patrol airfields on Souda Bay, Crete, and Sigonella, Sicily in addition to the recent approval to use the Greek Air Force airfield at Elefsis.

The mission of the Navy's proposed aircraft support facilities at Elefsis Airfield will be to provide shore-based operations and maintenance capability for up to 24 aircraft during four carrier maintenance periods each year. The Athens homeported carrier will be subjected to these maintenance periods on a regular basis. Only limited air wing operations will be conducted from Elefsis, consisting of maintenance flights or training flights to and from Souda Bay.

With regard to the possible use of the Sigonella airfield for this shore-based maintenance mission, the 450 mile distance between Athens and Sigonella compelled Navy to discard this alternative as it would result in separations and defeat the basic goal of overseas homeporting.

Souda Bay, being 150 miles south of Athens, would similarly result in separations and is unacceptable for the shore-based maintenance role, which requires the close proximity of the carrier with maintenance facilities and personnel. Further, the Souda Bay facilities are being upgraded to support new air logistics and ASW missions in the eastern Mediterranean. The air training environment at Souda Bay is good, with adequate air space, runway facilities and nearby NATO-constructured air-training ranges available. The Navy also has a small naval air facility at the Cappodichino Airport in Naples. This facility is used primarily to provide logistics support to units and bases in the Mediterranean and is not suitable for accommodating high performance jet aircraft, a requirement for the home ported air wing.

Admiral GADDIS. In general this is one of the major advantages of Athens compared with a number of other ports. The utilization of Elevsis Airfield, which is about 3 miles from the city of Elevsis and 14 or 16 miles from the scheduled carrier anchorage area, it is extremely handy. Commuting from one to the other is easy. It is on the same side of Athens as the anchorage facility. The availability of Souda Bay within 150 miles is also an advantage, we have a NATO maritime airfield, already in existence there, and we have in the process of construction or planned for construction a NATO air weapons range in addition to extremely fine airspace for training. Compared to the other ports concerned, I would say that Augusta Bay, which is close to Sigonella, would be next in convenience.

One of the major weaknesses of Taranto, is not having a good military airfield nearby. The airfield at Naples is handy, but for commuting you transit the worst traffic in Naples to get to it. So I would say on average the availability of airfield facilities at Athens is far better than the average in the Mediterranean and completely satisfactory to our purposes.

COOPERATION BY GREEK GOVERNMENT

Mr. SIKES. Have the Greek Government and the Greek Navy been fully cooperative?

Admiral GADDIS. We feel that they have been most cooperative. They obviously have operated on the basis to date that no independent costs short of NATO involvement should be borne by them purely as the result of our home porting. We agree with that. They have been most helpful in helping us to arrange, for instance, such things as the siting of destroyers at Elevsis and all other siting and operational problems.

Mr. SIKES. Have there been any changes of late in that attitude or are you receiving the same degree of cooperation and support from the Greek Government and the Greek Navy as you have in the past?

Admiral GADDIS. Our contact in the past couple of months has been minimal because, frankly, we did not want to be competitive for the time of the Greek Government when they had other things to do. However, we at no time have found them unwilling to talk, to negotiate, or to help. They have been most helpful.

I would note also that the other U.S. forces in Athens have been most helpful to the Navy as well, particularly the military advisory group headed by an Army major general.

Mr. SIKES. There are Greek Navy and Greek commercial shipyard piers in this area of the Straits of Salamis which is right next to Athens. Are these piers fully utilized?

Admiral GADDIS. We have on occasion for a period of a day or week been able to tie up ships at these piers, but only on a catch-as-catch-can basis. They are normally utilized and none are available for a continuous lease-type arrangement, which is the preferred way for us to utilize pier facilities at a home port.

Mr. SIKES. Where are your carrier and destroyers berthed at the present time?

Admiral GADDIS. Our destroyers at the present time are berthing at buoys at Elevsis Bay that are very close to the location of the relocatable pier, which they will commence occupying in either December or January.

Mr. SIKES. Would this area be capable of berthing or mooring carriers?

Admiral GADDIS. It is physically possible to moor a carrier in Elevsis Bay. However, the channel is not conducive to normal carrier passage without additional maintenance dredging possibly and some straightening.

Mr. SIKES. What would your answer be with regard to the Straits of Salamis, which has deeper water? Is there an adequate mooring for a carrier there or adequate berthing in that area?

Admiral GADDIS. It would be possible. There is no pier in that area at this time to which we could berth a CVA.

Mr. SIKES. Is there any area in the Straits of Salamis at which, if you were allowed access to it, you could build a pier?

Admiral GADDIS. Not in the Straits of Salamis, no.

Mr. SIKES. Where?

Admiral GADDIS. There is an area south of Salamis which is a possibility for a pier if we intend at some time to build a carrier pier there, but we do not. This is an area that is extremely busy with commercial shipping, both anchored and in transit to the various commercial facilities up and down the coast, which is adjacent there. The whole area, as you see in your map there from Piraeus, all the way around the corner to Skaramanga, is one continuous series of commercial operations.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Admittedly this is a crowded area, but the Navy itself, in its original request to the Greek Government, as I understand it, did request facilities at Hercules port?

Admiral GADDIS. We had hoped to lease a pier in that area, which is the only pier in the Athens port area. That was the initial request.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The pier facilities exist?

Admiral GADDIS. That is exactly correct. When we found those pier facilties could not be leased on a permanent long-term basis because of the commercial applications and use, then we consulted with the Greek Navy, as to what would be an appropriate place.

Mr. NICHOLAS. There are no Greek naval facilities in the area?

Admiral GADDIS. No, sir. They offered the area at Elevsis, where you see the destroyer pier there, south of the airfield, and we agreed completely that this would be most acceptable to our purpose.

RESTRICTED USE OF AIRFIELD FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. What is the basis for restricting airfield operations at Elevsis to 24 aircraft during RAV's and tightly restricting the number of sorties allowed?

Admiral GADDIS. This, frankly, is to give some measure of the amount of use that we would expect to require at Elevsis as compared to the use that the Greek Air Force and commercial operation intended to use the airport, merely to give it a feel for average loading. We agreed because we have never asked for more than 24 aircraft ashore at Elevsis.

Mr. SIKES. If this were a U.S. airfield, would we consider it nearly fully utilized in terms of runways or airspace?

[The information follows:]

U.S. Navy use of the Elevsis airfield will be largely limited to the four annual aircraft carrier maintenance periods at Athens (two each of 30 days duration and two each of 21 days duration). During these periods the facilities the Navy plans to provide at the airfield will be utilized to a degree consistent with a CONUS airfield. Inasmuch as the airfield is used by Greek forces on a year-round basis, it is presumed to be sufficiently utilized to satisfy their requirements.

Admiral GADDIS. We feel that the airfield has adequate capability to provide for the 24 aircraft on the average. That is all we need.

Mr. NICHOLAS. The question was, from our standpoint, from the standpoint of a Navy airfield such as North Island, is this airfield, in terms of the airfield, not the supporting facilities, fully utilized in terms of the amount of airplanes and sorties that the Greek——

Admiral GADDIS. I could not say precisely. I have a general feel from having talked to the head of the survey group that went to Elevsis. They felt that Elevsis was not as heavily utilized as our naval air stations are.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Are there severe problems with airspace there which would cause problems?

Admiral GADDIS. The only problem with airspace in the Athens area is the juxtaposition around Athens of four airports, one commercial and three Greek Air Force airfields. It is a matter of traffic control rather than anything else that would make any kind of training operations in that area less than desirable.

Mr. NICHOLAS. I understand you are limited to a loading of 24 aircraft. Is this a limitation on the number of aircraft that you can put in there at any time, or is it, as you implied, merely a guideline as to how much we would expect to use it?

Admiral GADDIS. No, sir; it is a limitation based on our estimate that would be the maximum number of aircraft we would ever require ashore to meet training requirements. We didn't ask for more.

LEASED FACILITIES

Mr. SIKES. Was it at our Navy's request that the facilities for the Navy in Athens were restricted to leased facilities?

Admiral GADDIS. We restricted ourselves to leased facilities in Athens on other than Greek Government property.

Mr. SIKES. Why is that?

Admiral GADDIS. Because as you probably recall from the initial presentation Admiral Zumwalt made of this idea on the Hill, the

object was to be austere and specifically to avoid at all costs either the appearance or the fact of building a U.S. naval base overseas.

Mr. SIKES. The leases will be for what period?

Admiral GADDIS. Most leases run for 3 years, some for 5 years.

Mr. SIKES. Is that long enough?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir, we feel completely adequate. Of course, they all have option clauses for renewal.

Mr. NICHOLAS. Have you looked into the possibility of construction versus leasing to determine which is the least costly? One answer I received on this question from the Navy said, in part: "The construction option is one we cannot consider because it is specifically prohibited by our agreement with the Government of Greece."

Admiral GADDIS. Military construction, as you gentlemen know far better than I, is limited to property which is owned by the host government or by the U.S. Government. All of the property that we are talking about, leases in support of our dependents or our people ashore, is all on privately owned property, and the leases are made with private citizens or companies.

Mr. NICHOLAS. You can buy property and build there, can you not?

Admiral GADDIS. We could if we could in fact do military construction. If we bought it, yes, sir. But then this would be an owned property. It would have the appearance of a base, even though everything was not in the same place. We would have a permanent commitment there.

Mr. SIKES. What is the period for which the leases can be renewed? What is the option?

Admiral GADDIS. It is my understanding that all leases have an option for at least one additional 5-year period.

Admiral LALOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have the terms of the leases for the record.

[The information follows:]

The Navy has leased the following facilities in Athens, with terms as indicated:

Facility	Term	Renewal option through—
Warehouse/open storage	June 1972 to June 1974	June 1977.
Fleet support office	September 1972 to September 1975	September 1980.
Fleet support office parking	August 1972 to August 1973	Do.
Multipurpose building	August 1972 to July 1975	July 1981.
Commander Task Force 60 quarters	July 1972 to August 1974	August 1976.
Commanding officer, fleet support office quarters	October 1972 to August 1973	August 1974.
Dependents school	September 1972 to August 1977	August 1982.
Post Office	October 1972 to September 1974	September 1980.
Human resources development training classrooms	October 1972 to September 1975	Do.
School supply storage/photo laboratory	March 1973 to March 1975	March 1978.
Destroyer squadron pier	January 1974 to January 1979	January 1984.
Medical	August 1972 to August 1975	None.
Medical parking	September 1972 to August 1973	Do.
General warehouse	June 1973 to June 1975	June 1983.
Commissary store parking	June 1973 to May 1974	May 1975.
Miscellaneous temporary leases	Terminated	Terminated.

Mr. SIKES. If we build facilities on leased property, aren't we subjecting ourselves to possible much higher cost that we may be out at the end of the lease period?

Admiral GADDIS. I do not feel so.

Admiral LALOR. No, sir. We followed what we have tracked as being the congressional intent on the use of lease construction or milcon. In

regard to lease construction, particularly where you start out with the fact we cannot use milcon on non-Government-owned land, generally speaking the logic that has been established over the years—and I might add, dealing with committees such as yours—has been that if you have a requirement that is not of guaranteed permanent nature, the economics are more attractive where you go lease construction. The point being that albeit the man who provides you the facility does modify the building or create a building to our requirement, but if this is located on his land and if the nature of the facility has a residual commercial utilization, such as everything we are talking about in Greece does, you are not paying the full value of that during the term of the lease. I think this is the basis, as it has been explained to me, why the Congress wants us to go lease construction under those circumstances.

Mr. SIKES. Are you proposing in the main lease construction?

Admiral LALOR. Yes, sir.

Admiral GADDIS. We prefer straight lease of a building if adequate facilities are available, if not then lease construction.

Mr. SIKES. Can you obtain the facilities, comforts, conveniences that you need in this type of arrangement?

Admiral LALOR. Yes, sir.

STATUS OF HOMEPORTING IN ATHENS

Mr. SIKES. What is the status of the homeporting in Athens?

Admiral GADDIS. Phase 1, of course, has been completed. It is a fact. We have a memorandum of understanding signed service to service which documents phase 1 and which outlines the agreed scope. We have a memorandum of understanding signed Service to Service which documents phase 1 and which outlines the agreed scope of phase 2, subject to an amendment to be negotiated at the time that phase 2 is approved for actual implementation.

Mr. SIKES. Have there been any problems which developed in connection with phase 2?

TECHNICAL AGREEMENT WITH GREEK GOVERNMENT

Admiral GADDIS. We have had no problems to date. For instance, on the airfield we have a letter of agreement in principle as to our use of the airfield. The Helenic Air Force and Navy are both completely knowledgeable of facilities that we propose to build there. We foresee no difficulty in developing the specifics of the technical arrangements.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have the agreements provided for the record.

Admiral GADDIS. We will be pleased to.

[The information follows:]

TECHNICAL ARRANGEMENT SIGNED JANUARY 8, 1973, BETWEEN THE GREEK NAVY AND THE U.S. NAVY INCIDENT TO HOMEPORTING IN ATHENS

INTRODUCTION

1. The Hellenic Navy and the Navy of the United States of America, in consideration of:

A. The Agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their Forces dated June 19, 1951;

B. The Agreement between the Kingdom of Greece and the United States of America concerning military facilities, concluded on October 12, 1953, except as hereinafter specified;

C. The Agreements concluded by and between the Kingdom of Greece and the United States of America on September 7, 1956, on the legal status of the United States Armed Forces in Greece;

D. Agreement No. 6553, signed between competent authorities of the Kingdom of Greece and the United States of America on June 2, 1956, concerning the procedures for customs clearance of personnel, personal effects and official supplies and equipment through the United States 7206th Support Group, Hellenikon;

E. The Proces-Verbal signed on August 28, 1972, by the appropriate authorities of the Kingdom of Greece and the United States of America reviewing and consolidating the existing procedures for handling United States aircraft and their passengers and to reinforce cooperation concerning North Atlantic Treaty Organization third-country use of the facilities at the United States 7206th Support Group, Hellenikon; agree to enter into the present Technical Arrangement concerning the request of the United States for the granting of "Homeporting" facilities within the Kingdom of Greece in order to serve the purposes of the

North Atlantic Alliance.

ARTICLE 1

1. The term "Homeporting" means the use of particular bays and ports within the Kingdom of Greece by designated numbers and types of ships of the United States Sixth Fleet for their periodic mooring during their deployment in the Mediterranean Sea, as well as the establishment of the personnel of such ships together with their families in adjacent areas.

2. The present Technical Arrangement contemplates the establishment ashore of limited logistical support activities only as herein described, in order to facilitate the periodic mooring in Greek waters of certain ships of the United States Navy and does not contemplate the establishment of a naval operational base or a naval dockyard.

3. The use of facilities hereby granted to ships of the United States Sixth Fleet shall be in accordance with customs and statutes of international and maritime law.

ARTICLE 2

1. Any areas of the anchorage facilities are part of the Kingdom of Greece and are subject to Greek legislation.

2. No flag shall be flown on the shore area of the Homeporting facilities, except on special occasions when both Greek and United States flags shall be flown.

ARTICLE 3

1. Any facilities and installations on land will be used by the United States Navy on rent.

2. Relocatable berthing facilities including the pier, approach trestle, utility platform and additional mooring buoys with all equipment and appurtenances thereto shall be leased from a legal entity, corporate under public or private law of the United States or Greece. The United States reserves the right to exercise an option to purchase the relocatable facilities at any time during the course of the lease period and to remove the same from the Homeporting area.

3. The ownership of all land areas and waters provided for a Homeporting site shall remain in the Kingdom of Greece, or, as the case may be, in a Greek entity incorporated under public or private law.

4. The Greek Government shall assume no responsibility whatsoever for the indemnification of the Government of the United States for the residual value of installations constructed by the United States Navy at its own expense.

ARTICLE 4

1. It is agreed in principle that the ships of the United States Sixth Fleet enjoying Homeporting facilities, together with the personnel and logistic support facilities thereof, will be comprised as follows, and that the Homeporting plan will be implemented in the following stages:

A. Stage 1:

(1) The Task Force Commander and his staff; a Fleet Support Office; and six destroyers with an embarked destroyer squadron commander and staff.

(2) Approximately 2,000 military personnel attached

to the above units and their approximately 1,200 dependents totaling approximately 3,200 persons in all.

B. Stage 2:

(1) An aircraft carrier.

(2) Approximately 4,500 military personnel attached to said aircraft carrier and their approximately 2,150 dependents, totaling approximately 6,650 persons in all.

2. A hospital type ship may be added to the above ships, with an appropriate number of military personnel and their dependents.

3. The consent of the appropriate Greek authorities is required prior to the implementation of any of the above stages.

4. The area referred to in Article 5, below, is designated as the Homeporting area for the implementation of Stage 1.

5. Should the Homeporting area or the granted facilities be modified, both parties to this Technical Arrangement shall amend the text hereof, as appropriate, or shall enter into a new Technical Arrangement.

6. The Homeporting area and shore facilities associated with the implementation of Stage 2 will be the subject of an agreed amendment to this Technical Arrangement.

7. Auxiliary craft of the United States Sixth Fleet required for the logistic support of the main units may also use the facilities for the Homeporting area with the concurrence of the Hellenic Naval Command.

ARTICLE 5

1. The land Homeporting area at Eleusis, 160 meters in length and bordered on the northwestern side by a line five meters from the existing road, appears on the attached map.

2. The following installations, if constructed, may be constructed within the Homeporting area:

A. A relocatable pier, as outlined on the attached map, with sufficient lighting;

B. A walled fence approximately two meters high, with barbed wire;

C. An entrance gatehouse to be used jointly by Hellenic and United States Navy security personnel and Hellenic customs authorities;

D. A 400 square-meter warehouse;

E. A laundry;

F. Open storage spaces;

G. Utilities for the pier and support compound, to include electricity, water, steam, land communications and sewer system;

H. A small refreshment facility.

3. Any additional facilities to be constructed in the land Homeporting area must be approved by the appropriate Hellenic Naval Authorities.

ARTICLE 6

1. Ships sailing to and from the Homeporting area must observe the Eleusis Bay routes and any and all security and sailing provisions of the Salamis Arsenal. At the sight of the Salamis Arsenal signal station, such ships must at all times signal their visual callsigns.

2. As provided for in Greek legislation, the Eleusis Homeporting area is part of the restricted Salamis Arsenal area and Naval Training Command. Therefore, the Commanding Officer, U.S. Navy Fleet Support Office, shall ensure that commanding officers of Homeported ships are fully informed of all special security and sailing provisions of that area and take appropriate measures to ensure compliance.

ARTICLE 7

1. The ships designated for each stage of Homeporting will be made known by the United States Navy to the Hellenic Naval Command at least one month prior to their arrival in Greece. Any alteration of the designated ships will be made known in advance to the Hellenic Naval Command.

2. The Hellenic Naval Command and the Hellenic Naval Commander of the area shall be informed by signal in advance of any movement of ships cleared to use the Homeporting area.

3. Port calls by Homeported ships in other regions of the Kingdom of Greece and transit by these ships through Greek territorial waters shall be conducted in compliance with standard clearance procedures as well as provisions of international and maritime law.